COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOLUME X.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
THE LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN.
1890.

INDEX TO VOLUME X.

NO. 1.

PAGE.

Introductory to Volume X, by Prof. M. Loy, D.D.. 1
The Anti-Semitic Agitation, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D.. 10
The Bible and Missions, by Rev. E. Pfeiffer..... 18
The Seed and the Soil, by Prof. M. Loy, D.D..... 41

NO. 2.

The Ground of Divorce, by Prof. M. Loy, D.D.. 65
The Biblical Criticism of Our Day, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 81
The Religion of Secret Societies, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette 90
The Christian Principle in Science, by Prof. M. Loy, D.D..... 103
Missionary Department, by Rev. E. Pfeiffer, A. M. —
The One Thing Needful 112
Literature 115
Editorial Brevities..... 127

NO. 3.

The Protestant Church of Germany, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 129
The Sacrament of Baptism, Translated from Hollaz 137
Vows, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette 159
Missionary Department, by Rev. E. Pfeiffer, A. M. —
The Moravian, The Missionary Church.. 168
Our Students and the Cause of Missions.. 178
"The Crisis of Missions"..... 185
Thoughts on Matthew 23, 37, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 189

NO. 4.

PAGE.

The Dawn of the Reformation, by Rev. H. J. Schuh..... 193
Nebuchadnezzar's Dream, by Prof. Wm. Schmidt..... 212
Trust in Providence, by Prof. M. Loy, D.D..... 230
Historical and Doctrinal Texts, Translated by Rev. C. H. Rohe... 240
Editorial Brevities, by Prof. M. Loy, D.D..... 242
Missionary Department —
The Student Volunteer Movement, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 246
Literature, by Rev. E. Pfeiffer, A. M..... 253

NO. 5.

The Union of All Lutherans, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..... 257
The Path That Leads To Peace, by Rev. William Loehe, Translated by Rev. E. Schultz 273
Insurance, by Prof. M. Loy, D.D..... 284
Our Lord's Humiliation, by Prof. M. Loy, D.D..... 301
Mission Work in the Far West, by Rev. L. H. Schuh..... 313
Pastoral Study, by Prof. M. Loy, D.D..... 317

NO. 6.

The Use of Fiction, by Prof. M. Loy, D.D..... 321
Parallels Between St. Paul and Luther, by Rev. P. A. Peter..... 339
The New Theology in Germany, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D... 347
The Support of our Synod's Work, by Rev. D. Simon..... 354
The Baptism of the Holy Ghost, by Rev. Geo. Dillmann..... 367
Homiletic Rules, from J. A. Quenstedt's "Ethica pastoralis." Translated by Rev. E. Schultz..... 372

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. X. FEBRUARY, 1890. No. 1.

INTRODUCTORY TO VOLUME X.

It would be a source of rejoicing to us if now, after our MAGAZINE has labored in the interest of the Lutheran Church for nine years, we could convince ourselves that this labor is no longer needed. Those on whom the burden of conducting the journal falls are not in a position to perform useless labor for pastime. They have no time to waste. But these are not days in which men who know and appreciate the pure Gospel which was restored to the Church through the instrumentality of Dr. Luther can consent to be silent, or to ignore the power of the press. Our MAGAZINE was begun because there was a call to bear testimony in the English language to the truth which God has given us and commanded us to maintain; it is continued because the necessity is still upon us with voice and pen to contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.

There is an unsteadiness in the theology of our times that corresponds to the restlessness and uneasiness prevailing in other departments of thought and life. Everything seems uncertain. Rumblings are heard in all directions that forebode catastrophe, and the feeling of insecurity, as to whither all is drifting or what is impending, is painful. A science falsely so called has been boldly pushing itself forward in all departments of knowledge, and endeavors to

revolutionize theology as well as all systems of nature. Many of those whom God has made watchmen upon the walls of Zion take fright at the boldness of these advances, and make concession after concession until there is nothing left worth defending or surrendering. As against all such unbelief and uncertainty and treachery we desire to bear our humble testimony to the truth in Jesus, which is to the Greeks foolishness and to the Jews a stumbling block, but which is the only hope and salvation for a sin-cursed and benighted world And we bear this testimony in the full confidence that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church and that our labor, slight and slighted as it may be, shall not be in vain in the Lord. Men who are puffed up with a vain philosophy may sneer at the truth of the Gospel, but it is the power of God and must triumph.

While various denominations of Christians have become unsettled in their faith and are clamoring for a revision of their creeds, we shall continue to advocate the old truth which our fathers defended against the Romish Antichrist and the various enthusiasts who agreed with him in their refusal to accept the Word of God as the only source and norm of faith and life, and shall therefore plead for the old Confessions of the Lutheran Church in all their integrity. "Hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." The reason for our retention and contention is not that the Church has any authority to impose a creed, and that now, since the Book of Concord has for centuries been the confession of the Ev. Lutheran Church, no change is possible without rebellion against her authority. We recognize no authority to lay anything on men's consciences but that of God. "One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren." Matt. 23, 8. If the Lutheran Confession is not, in the estimation of any man, the correct statement of what the Word of God reveals for our faith, that man has not only the right, but the duty to reject it. The creed must express what our hearts believe. But our hearts must

believe, if we would be Christians and enjoy the rights and blessings of Christians, what the Word of God declares. Therefore we can not concede the right of such an individual to impose himself upon the Lutheran Church as one of her members, nor admit that it is all well with him, and will be all well with him on the day of judgment. If he does not believe what the Lutheran Church confesses, there is no authority in the Lutheran Church, or in any other Church, to compel him to believe it. God alone has authority in such matters, and God has given us His Word for our guide: before Him the soul stands or falls, the Word being the rule by which it shall be judged. Each individual must answer for himself on the great day of final account. If one does not believe the truth which is set forth in our Confession, he is free to renounce it.

But two things must be kept in mind. In the first place, he must not put forth the false claim that he is one of those who are known in history and all the world over as Lutherans. That which gives them their distinctive character and name is the distinctive faith which is confessed in the Book of Concord. If he persists in calling himself a Lutheran while he renounces the Lutheran faith, or accepts a faith that is known by another name, he sails under false colors and deceives the people. His guilt is not less than that of one who employs false weights and measures or sells false wares. We hope it is not necessary to say that we make this statement not because of any personal animosities, but because of the objective dishonesty of the proceeding of men who claim to be what they are not. And more than this we must, for the truth's sake, say in regard to them. They have a right, if they do not believe the truth which the Lutheran Church confesses, to reject the Lutheran Confession; but it is mere arrogance and impudence to assume that on that account the historical Lutheran Church has ceased to exist or has changed its historical faith and creed. It is a preposterous piece of presumption for

any man to claim that because he does not believe the Lutheran doctrine of Baptism or the Lord's Supper, therefore those who do believe it have no right to confess it or to preserve the identity of the Lutheran Church with her distinctive creed. There is nothing to hinder those who are not in accord with our old faith and confession from saying so and going out from us. They have the same privilege to deny that we have to affirm. But there is a great deal to hinder their claiming to be of those who affirm whilst they exercise their privilege of denying. That is not the candor and straight-forwardness which befits Christians. In the second place, the denial of the Lutheran faith, whilst it secures exemption from any obligation to the Lutheran Church as a visible organization, does not invalidate the claims of the divine truth which this Church confesses. That is a different matter. The doctrine which we confess is not urged upon the conscience by virtue of the Lutheran Church's authority, but by virtue of the divine authority of God's Word. If that doctrine be rejected, the authority which renders it obligatory remains, and on the judgment day it will be asserted and maintained. We therefore cannot concede that those who reject our creed have the absolute right to do this and have no account to render. They are responsible to God, and to Him they must answer for it. And to Him we leave it. Those who confess the truth of the Lutheran symbols are recognized as Lutherans because of such confession; those who do not accept that truth are not bound to confess it, but must therefore not claim to be of us, and must see, as not the Church, but the Lord by His Word makes it obligatory on them, how they shall stand before Him when by that Word they are to be judged. In a free land the doctrine and claims of the Lutheran Church may be rejected, and any one may thus place himself beyond her jurisdiction, but obviously that does not put him beyond the jurisdiction of the Lord, who requires us to receive and confess the truth.

Nor is there the proper clearness and consistency even among those who profess to accept the doctrines of the great Church of the Reformation. While the Calvinistic churches are drifting away from their old moorings, the largest synod bearing the Lutheran name in this country has adopted a system that accords with Reformed theories, and would satisfy the average Calvinists even of the olden time. This lamentable defection of a body that once took the lead in bearing testimony to the precious truth of the Gospel, renders it all the more necessary that those who still stand fast in the old faith should be active in urging its claims and defending it against new assaults. The Missouri Synod, by its earnest and self-denying labors before the sorrowful new departure took place, gained prestige and power. This renders it a formidable impediment in the way of the advancement of our pure Lutheran faith. All the more is this the case because of the prevailing indifference in regard to the sound biblical doctrine. Even in the Missouri Synod itself, which once did so noble a work in advocating the old faith and leading souls to see the importance of holding fast the form of sound words, there is not sufficient vigor and earnestness, on the part of those who have no sympathy with Calvinistic theories, to lift up their voices against them. And among the synods belonging to other larger organizations there has been no concern manifested about the aberrations of Missouri. So far as can be observed, none have cared. The indifference on all sides is deplorable, and admonishes men of faith not to be silent.

No doubt the failure of the General Council to conform its practice to the Lutheran Confession which it adopts, is attributable largely to the same source.

Among churches which are organized on the principle that the bond of union is an agreement merely in human opinion and sentiment, with the general acceptance of the Bible and Christianity as a guide, there is ample room for variety of belief and feeling, and unionistic impulses and

movements are the natural result. When under such conditions the general claim of Christian character is placed against the requirement of special opinion, it is no wonder that sectarians are nonplused. This argument of charity and liberality is then unanswerable. If Methodists and Winebrennerians should refuse to admit Presbyterians or United Brethren to their pulpits or altars because of a diversity of opinion on some points that are alleged to be settled indeed by these respective churches, but that are admitted not to be settled by the Word of God, the rejected brethren would have reason to raise the cry of selfishness and narrowness and bigotry and all uncharitableness against those who reject them; for what right has one party, while it concedes that the other possesses all that the Bible and Christianity requires, to deny that party the rights which the Lord has given all Christians? There is a difference of opinion, indeed, in regard to some things that the Lord has not decided in His Word and that can therefore form no article of faith; but what right has any sect to make such a difference in human opinion a barrier to the enjoyment of church privileges? Men may organize societies and establish any conditions of membership that seem to them proper; but they cannot rightfully call such societies churches, when they have rejected the conditions of membership which Christ has laid down, and substituted some fancies of their own. When Methodists admit that what separates them from Presbyterians is not divine, and may therefore be set aside without sin, how could they refuse to admit such as confess the Presbyterian doctrine to membership in their churches, or to the rights of members at the holy communion? They differ only in a human opinion or sentiment, and those who, because of such a difference, would deny to a Christian rights and privileges which the Lord has conferred, are bigoted and uncharitable. Sectarian notions of church organization are radically unionistic because radically unbiblical.

But the General Council accepts the doctrine which is set forth in the Confessions of the Ev. Lutheran Church, and can therefore only by a lamentable inconsistency pursue the sectarian practice. By statements such as this we have repeatedly offended men whom we would rather conciliate. But it is required of a steward that he be found faithful. We must not suppress the plain truth because to some it is unpalatable. Nor do we despair of getting some at least to see what is so plain. We recognize the need of testifying, and have no despairing thought that the truth will be spoken in vain, even though many should think that it is not spoken in love. If that doctrine which is confessed in our symbols is really the truth of God, and such truth as it is needful to set forth in the creed of the Church, then it is impossible for the believer to surrender it or any part of it. We cannot do as we please with that which the Lord has given us to confess and promulgate. If it is not God's Word, it must not be insisted on as a condition of membership in our churches. Then our own children must no more be required to believe it than any others. Indeed, then it is a grievous sin to impose it as obligatory upon any man's conscience That would be adding to God's Word and binding human traditions on the souls that Christ has made free. But then it follows of necessity that the Lutheran Church is an apostate sect, that does not stand upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone, but upon human opinions which do not bind the conscience and cannot save. That is not the position of the General Council. It accepts the Confessions of the Lutheran Church as the proper and adequate expression of the truth which the Lord has given us to believe and confess. That truth is binding upon all, and it is preached and maintained that all may receive it. Hence it ought to be clear that no one who rejects it can be admitted to our pulpits or our altars. How then could it be possible to make any exceptions without declaring that in some cases the truth of

God is not binding, or that the Church may dispense souls from the obligation of receiving it? It would be doubting the power of truth to suppose that all testimony in this regard will be borne in vain. Eventually men must give up the Lutheran position or order their practice according to its requirements. In one way or another sincerity will work itself out into consistency.

Under any circumstances the Ohio Synod would be bound, according to the measure of her gift and opportunity, to help in the great work to which God has called the Ev. Lutheran Church on this continent. It is neither faithful to God nor fair to the brethren to lay the whole burden upon others which we have an equal vocation to bear. As in the great work of education and missions, so in the equally important work of defending and spreading the truth through the instrumentality of the press, our synod has a part to bear. But especially in the present condition of the Church has she a grave and solemn duty. The Synodical Conference, which once delighted to show its harmony with the old theologians of the Lutheran Church, and to direct attention to the treasures of learning and piety which their writings contain, finds it prudent now to discourage their use and to rail against us for loving them still, though we do not now and never did put forward the old dogmaticians as proof in any such way as that which was customary among the Missourians before their defection rendered these dogmaticians witnesses against their errors. Missouri has ceased to bear testimony for the old truth. Even the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith has been corrupted by its fundamental error in regard to predestination, and the theological system which it is developing, though it be ostensibly in opposition to all systems, as some sects elaborate a creed in opposition to all creeds, is as dangerous as, coming under the Lutheran name, it is delusive. The General Synod has men in it who are in sympathy with the Lutheran Church and are growing in Lutheran consciousness, but its teaching

and practice is not such as to render its publications strengthening, or even safe, to our people. It has never accepted the Lutheran distinctive doctrines as necessary parts of revealed truth, and is therefore unionistic in principle. While some profess to believe these distinctive doctrines as founded upon the Word of God, they are not willing to make them conditions of membership in the Church or of the enjoyment of the privileges belonging to members. Virtually therefore the distinctively Lutheran doctrine is to them a mere opinion that can be surrendered with impunity, and that must be surrendered in the interest of peace and charity. So far as we can see even the conservative portion of the General Synod occupies no better position than this, while the radical portion does not hesitate to declare its repudiation of Lutheran doctines and its condemnation of Lutheran practice. The United Synod in the South has no certain position, and nothing of any consequence is to be expected from that quarter for the defence of the old faith. Good words and true are spoken by noble Christian men in the General Council, but they are hampered and hindered by the unfortunate inconsistency which has been the bane of that body and renders all its work unstable and unsatisfactory. Therefore our synod has a special calling to lift up its voice like a trumpet, and use every means in its power to advocate evangelical truth in an evil time that does not love it.

That our synod deems it necessary to bear its testimony in the English as well as in the German language will not seem strange to those acquainted with the situation. We need an English theological journal for our own people, many of whom can not use any other language with profit. But we need it for others also. If there are those who assume that our Evangelical Lutheran Church has nothing to say to the American people that it is important for them to hear, with them we are not agreed. We have a message from God to men, and they will do well to hear it. The

men of this land are not excluded. They have as much need to hear it as the men of any other land. We may be able to reach but a small number, but it is not the way of wisdom to despise the day of small things. The great Church of the Reformation has a light that must not be hidden. Let it shine. The MAGAZINE is set for the defense of Gospel truth, and means to testify, whether men will hear or forbear. M. LOY.

THE ANTI-SEMITIC AGITATION.

The recent expulsion by the Russian government of a large number of Jews from Odessa and other cities in the South Eastern part of the Empire is a renewed reminder, that for almost a whole decade the Central and Eastern nations of Europe have been agitated by a movement of hostility to the Jews. This is a social problem so unique and enigmatical in character, that it is exceedingly difficult for American readers, in whose surroundings the conditions for the existence of such a vexed disorder are almost entirely wanting, to understand intelligently the factors and forces that have produced it and have given it such remarkable vitality. The anti-Semitic agitation is the determination to root out as much as possible the influence of Jews and Judaism in the public and private life of the nations. Ever and anon it breaks out in bitter enmity to this peculiar people in Germany, Austro-Hungary, Russia, Rumania and throughout the South East of the continent. In various ways has it found an expression, and it still shows itself to be a positive factor in shaping the course of events. Russia, generally followed by Rumania, in full conformity with its autocratic government, simply employs brute force, and during the last half-dozen years has repeatedly banished thousands of helpless children of Abraham from the Empire. Neither Germany nor Austria has resorted to such measures. But in both empires there is a strong faction with the

avowed programme of fighting the Jews. The number and influence of those adhering to these factions are so great that, although the problem has never been officially considered by either government, the movement seriously interferes with other interests, and has become one of the most aggressive and resolute agitations that trouble the political and social waters of Europe.

In its present phase the agitation is but little over a decade old, yet among its leaders are men high in the councils of state and church, literature and education, while the movement itself has spread wherever the Jewish population is sufficiently large to make its influence felt. In Germany an organization was effected at a Congress of Anti-Semitics held in Cassel in 1886 called "The German Anti-Semitic Union," among whose membership are found men who otherwise represent all shades of thought. The strictly conservative class, however, who are in harmony with Court-preacher Stoecker's opposition to the Jews and aim at the destruction of their power through moral and religious principles, have held aloof from the "Union" on account of its radical tendencies. Indeed Anti-Semitism is also a house divided against itself, and there are at least three or four parties. While all agree as to the need of the agitation, they disagree as to the character of the danger and still more as to the remedy. The best organized opposition is that of the Union, which has established a literature of its own on the vexed problem.

As a rule the character and animus of the movement are misinterpreted. It is not, at least not primarily or officially, a persecution for religions sake. Avowedly it is not a religious agitation at all, but purely a social one. Nor is it a revival of mediaeval Anti-Judaism after the manner of Pfefferkorn *et id genus omne.* In the nature of the case this is impossible, since only the social relations of modern society, as these have been formed in our own times, offer the conditions under which Anti-Semitism has sprung into

existence and has developed such vitality and vigor. The opposition is directed against the Jews, not as representatives of a certain religious system, but as the exponents of certain race characteristics, traits, and tendencies. For this reason it is called "Anti-Semitism," and not "Anti-Judaism." Only in so far as the religious peculiarities of the Jews, in their doctrines and morals, are regarded as expressive of their race peculiarities as members of the Semitic family of peoples, can the movement be said to have a religious character. Put into a nutshell, the central thought of Anti-Semitism is this, that the manners and methods of Jewish thought and work, as expressive of the ethical ideas and ideals of Semitism, are in hopeless antagonism to the principles of the right and the true which control modern life and thought and which are the product of Aryan and Christian soil; and, further, as a consequence, that the growing influence of this Semitism, as this has been developing in the Jewish prominence in those departments of activity which lead and direct the life of the age, such as business, literature, education, politics, etc., is a real menace to the best features of the existing order of things and therefore should, as a matter of self-defence and in the interests of a healthy civilization, be resisted and suppressed. In the "Anti-Semitic Catechism," the *vademecum* of these people, the fourth question is this: "What is then the real object of the Anti-Semitics?" To this the answer is given: "The aim is to have the Jewish influence in the various departments of life curtailed through legal means, because they regard this influence as dangerous." In the constitution adopted by the Cassel Congress, § 1, defining the object, says: "This organization aims, by legal means, to curtail the Jewish influence in the economic, social, and political fields, and also the establishment of special alien laws for the Jews." The second question in the Catechism expressly disclaims that the movement has anything to do with the religion of this peculiar people as such; and of the

267,000 persons who signed the petition in Germany in 1881 addressed to the Chancellor, there were probably but few who laid much stress on the religious side of the question when they asked for special legislation against this historic people and its growing power in the house of its benefactors.

It is now plain why the modern opposition to the Jews is different in kind from any that has preceded it. The present is the century of emancipation, also for the Jews. England at the beginning of the century began to remove the political disabilities of the Israelites and the other nations soon followed, and full equality was granted them in Central Europe in the revolution year of 1848–49. It is only in Russia and Eastern Europe that this has not yet taken place. The Jews have thus for about half a century been permitted to engage in the struggle for existence on a perfectly equal footing with their Aryan neighbors. These new liberties, generously granted them by their Japhetic brothers, in whose tents they are living since they lost their own patrimony, they are charged with having abused. The Jew is crowding himself forward in every department of life. He will under no condition be a producer and earn his bread in the sweat of his brow; he seeks above all to gain control of those callings where he can live on the profits of what others produce. The Jews will not divide up among the various callings, businesses, and trades of men, as do the other nations; they unite to secure the management of those agencies which are the sources of influence and power in moulding the life and thought of the hour, in the world of finance, business, journalism, education, politics, etc., and accordingly they are exercising an influence not only altogether out of proportion to their numerical strength, but, on account of their principles and morals, injurious to the interests of society and the public welfare.

Upon what facts and data are these charges based? There can be no doubt that to a great measure the latter are well substantiated. Complete statistics of the proportion

of Jews in the leading professions and callings have of course not been collected. But those lines in which such data are at hand, may fairly be regarded as typical and representative. In Germany, for instance, the Jews constitute little more than one per cent. of the inhabitants. Yet among the non-theological university teachers they constitute nearly ten per cent. Of the 1,326 non-theological professors in the 22 universities of the Fatherland 96 are Jews or of Jewish descent, i. e. 7½ per cent. Of the 529 *privatdocenten*, that is those who are candidates for appointment to professorships and impart instruction without remuneration, 84 are Jews, i. e. about 17½ per cent. Notably at Berlin and Breslau is this element strongly represented. Of 42 medical professors in Berlin 13 are Jews; of 15 law professors 3 are Jews; of 88 members of the philosophical faculty 13 are Jews. Of the 124 *privatdocenten* as high as 25 are Jews. At Breslau of the 79 regular professors 15 are Jews, and of the 27 *privatdocenten* 12 are of this people. That this disproportion is rather increasing than decreasing is evident from the fact that the ranks of the *privatdocenten* is so crowded by young Jewish teachers. And that the future has still more in store in this direction is clear from the statistics of those schools which are feeders to the universities and to the professions. The data from Berlin, taken from the statistics of 1887, are instructive in this regard. Of the 1,400,000 inhabitants of the German metropolis, 67,000 are Jews. According to this, of the 23,481 pupils in the gymnasia, technical and other high schools of the city, 22,357 ought to be non-Jewish and 1,124 Jews. But in reality the respective figures are 18,666 and 4,815. In other words, the Jewish element is represented four or five times as strongly as it it entitled to in all fairness. In Austria the Jews constitute less than five per cent. of the population. Yet of the 5,721 students in attendance at the university at Vienna in the winter term of 1885–86 there were 2,085 Jews, a percentage seven times greater than the relative Jewish contingent in the population would lead

us to expect. In the same term the ten gymnasia of Vienna had an attendance of 2,247 Christian, but of 1,174 Jewish pupils. In many of the high schools of the Austrian capital the Jews outnumber the Christians. In the 24 so-called middle schools, leading up to the universities, there were 7,708 pupils, namely 4,888 Roman Catholics, 474 Protestants, and 2,262 Jews. In the 146 public schools, of an attendance of 76,844, the Jews furnished 10,110. In the year 1884 there were born 25,600 children in Vienna of Christian parents and 2,068 of Jews, or twelve times as many Christian children as Jewish; and yet in the higher grades of schools of every five children in attendance two are Jews.

The inevitable result of this has been and evidently will be to a greater extent in coming years, the crowding of the professions other than the theological by Jews. In Germany matters in this regard are bad enough in themselves, so that the overcrowding of the professions, and the rapid growth of a "learned proletariat" has become a distinct social problem within the last ten years. The struggle of the Jews for places and positions of influence has made bad worse. Berlin has no less than 187 Jewish lawyers. Of the 660 lawyers in Vienna 350, or more than fifty per cent. are Jews. Of the 2,140 lawyers in the province of Lower Austria 1,024, or 47 per cent. are Jews; and of the 370 persons of that province who registered as "literary men," only 45 were not Jews.

This latter fact draws attention to another matter; namely, that in other fields too the same state of affairs exists. Notably is this the case in journalism. One reason why the general character of the daily press in the larger cities of central Europe are anti-Christian is because they are almost entirely in the hands of the Jews. And the Jews of Western Europe and of America are almost to a man "reformed," i. e. they are practically radicals and rationalists, having thrown aside the landmarks of their historic faith and made a compromise with the most dangerous elements of

modern thought. The regular Jew with the traditional faith is found almost exclusively in the Eastern countries. The great majority of the papers in Berlin, Paris, Vienna, Frankfort, Hamburg and other centers are in the hands of and are managed by the capital of Jews. In Vienna e. g. all but two of the dailies are edited by Jews. In Berlin only the *Kreuzzeitung*, the *Germania*, and one or two others are in Christian hands. In France it is claimed that 1746 papers have Jewish editors, in Italy 692. In France the Jewish contingent is much smaller than it is in Germany or Austria, but relatively their influence is greater. In all the higher circles and positions the Jews abound and superabound.

Of course it is in the world of finance and business that the Jewish power is chiefly felt. And in this regard the complaints from over all Europe are loud and long. In many districts of Posen, in Prussia, where the Jews constitute one-eighth of the population, and in Hungary, where they constitute one-fourteenth, and in Galicia, where they constitute one-ninth, it is almost impossible for a Christian to maintain himself in any of the non-producing callings. The Jews monopolize and manage to control them all. Indeed it was the financial measures of the Jews in Germany that caused the cloud of Anti-Semitism to rise above the horizon of Europe. When the tremendous financial crash in 1873 came in Germany, in which literally hundreds of millions of marks were lost in wild speculation, it was soon learned that the chief of sinners in this nefarious work were the Jewish bankers and brokers.

Were this prominence of the Jews merely a "survival of the fittest" in the ups and downs of modern life, it would in itself probably not be a cause of regret. But with considerable show of right and reason it is claimed that this influence is dangerous, because it is backed by dangerous influences, namely that of modern radicalism. Considerable stir has been created by the charges and counter charges in regard to the so-called "Shulchan Aruch," or law book of

Mediaeval Judaism, which certainly sanctions outrageous treatment of all who are non-Jews, some maintaining that it even justifies the use of Christian blood for ritual purposes in the synagogue. But the modern Jews deny all authority to these books as far as they themselves are concerned. More satisfactory than this discussion are the data that have been taken from criminal statistics as to the relation of Aryans and Jewish crime. The attempt is made with some show of success, to show that in those crimes in which the moral principles and faculty of the culprit, and not his native passion and physical strength merely are exerted, the proportional preponderance of Jews over others is the tangible proof of the dangerous character of the influence of this strange people. In the annals of such crimes as murder, arson, robbery, etc., the names of Jews are but seldom found. But in perjury, forgery, bankruptcy, etc., the proportion of Jews is exceedingly large. According to the official statistics of Prussia for the years 1870–78, there were during these years 6,430 convictions for perjury. The Jews numbering fewer than one in eighty of the inhabitants should have furnished 85 of these criminals. But in reality they furnished 219, or $2\frac{1}{2}$ times as many as their share. Of the 6378 convictions for forgery, only 82 ought to have been Jews; instead of this there were 289. Of the 1129 convictions for illegal bankruptcy there ought to have been only 15 Jews; but in reality there were 268, or eighteen times the normal quota.

Data like these are advanced to show that the Jews of our day are controlled by the same principles that control the Semitics of the Orient. Not seldom are they accordingly called "The Beduins of modern civilization," the leading propensities being in accordance with the principles of pure selfish greed to prey upon their neighbors, with little or no regard to the principles of right and wrong as maintained by modern civilized people.

The remedies prepared by the anti-Semitic Union is legally to disfranchise the Jews and thus to restore them to the status of the anti-emancipation period. They accordingly aim at mere force as a protection against the Jewish influence, not at a reformation and betterment of the Jews themselves. Here lies the great weakness and even wrong of the agitation. The section headed by Stoecker is more Christian in its tendencies, but none of the anti-Semitics seem to have any particular love for the work of evangelization among the Israelites. And yet this is in the nature of the case the only solution of the riddle. If the principles of modern Judaism are wrong and baneful, as they undoubtedly are, then it is the duty of Christian men to teach them better principles. From this standpoint and position, the attitude of the venerable lover of Israel, Professor Franz Delitzsch of Leipzig, is correct in opposing all and every branch of the anti-Semitic clause. While the evil is undoubtedly a real one, the curative and corrective proposed are wrong or inadequate. The existence of this problem is only one more argument in favor of a vigorous prosecution of the work of Jewish missions, of persuading Israel to accept the spiritual inheritance which their fathers rejected. Fortunately in this field too, the nineteenth is the greatest missionary century since the days of the Apostles, but interest in the work is confined to limited circles and has not by any means secured the general sympathy of the Church and of Christians as has the department of foreign missions. Here too is another opening and opportunity for great and good work in the glorious scheme of the evangelization of the world.

G. H. Schodde.

THE BIBLE AND MISSIONS.

In view of the apathy and lethargy prevailing among so many professing Christians on the subject of missions, it

has been said with considerable appearance of truth that "two conversions are needful: first, to Christ as the Savior from sin; and then to missions as the corrective and antidote to selfishness." And yet, when we consider the extent in which the missionary idea pervades the Bible and underlies the whole economy of salvation, it appears strange and inexplicable that such twofold "conversion" should even seem to be necessary. At a ministers' meeting in Northampton, in 1786, William Carey was induced, after much urging on the part of his elder brethren, to propose a question for general discussion. At length he submitted the following: "Whether the command given to the apostles to 'teach all nations' was not obligatory on all succeeding ministers to the end of the world, seeing that the accompanying promise was of equal extent?" He was denounced as a miserable enthusiast for asking such a question. By the Lord's grace a great change has come over the world and the Church since that time. The present "missionary century"—the beginning of the third great missionary period of the world—has thoroughly vindicated the plea for universal missions and forever dispelled the presumption that the scheme is Utopian and impracticable. And from present indications the tide of missionary life seems to be rising in all parts of the world. Christian churches gathered and planted in the midst of heathendom, less than half a century old, are vying with the mother churches of Christendom in evangelizing the dark portions of the earth and making this last quarter of the century more brilliant in missionary enterprises and achievements than any of its predecessors.

We Lutheran people—especially we of the Joint Synod of Ohio—so far from taking a leading part in spreading the Word of the cross, are decidedly in the rear of the Lord's hosts that are marching upon and subjugating the strongholds of heathendom. What is the cause of our inferiority? We belong to the Church, whose distinguishing glory is the

thoroughly and profoundly Scriptural character of her professions, the church that desires to live "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Is it possible that we have failed to read aright the Word of life in its relation to the world's evangelization? Has our study of the Bible been attended by an elimination of the missionary thoughts and directions with which it abounds? Or seeing and comprehending them, are we willing to ignore them, and will we refuse to appropriate and apply them? Let me cite the testimony of a distinguished student of the Bible and advocate of missions. "It is remarkable," writes Dr. Warneck,* "how very many preachers and teachers are blind to the abundance of missionary thoughts contained in the Bible. They may fairly stumble over the missionary words, and yet they overlook them and pass on. On the other hand, let the eye be opened to the missionary thoughts of the Scriptures, and we marvel not only at their abundance, but also in view of the fact that they are all grown together and interwoven with the central truths and central duties of Christianity." In the first volume of his "Missionsstunden" the same author has furnished the most conclusive evidence that "we need not resort to allegorizing, in order to lay a fund of missionary thoughts into the Scriptures; this fund is there of itself, and we need only to dig in order to discover it." And again, he declares*: "The Acts of the Apostles has appeared to me almost like a new book, since I have learned to read it from a missionary point of view. And I had a similar experience with regard to the life and epistles of Paul."

The place which the subject of missions occupies in the Bible determines the place which it ought to occupy in the Church, in the hearts and lives of God's people. Clearness in regard to the former is essential to clearness in regard to

*Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift. 1887, p. 391.

*Das Studium der Mission auf der Universitaet, p. 13.

the latter. As long as the missionary idea is regarded as an incidental or accidental concomitant of the Gospel, so long will mission work be regarded as optional with Christians. When we pastors, with our people, have learned to comprehend the true state of things, when the study of the Bible, with open eyes and praying hearts, begins to form and deepen the conviction that missions spring from the very heart of the Gospel and are the out-working of its essential and fundamental character, that the missionary idea is interwoven with the whole counsel of God unto salvation, with the essential character of Christianity, and with the life of the Christian Church, we shall have made a great stride forward in the direction of rightly appreciating and earnestly prosecuting the work of missions. Let me quote again from a missionary pleader, acquaintance with whose writings cannot fail to be alike gratifying and stimulating to the general reader and especially to the pastor. "If I mistake not, the missionary life of to-day needs *deepening*, and to the end of such deepening the profound study of God's Word is indispensable. For the *wakening* too of a true missionary life —this conviction becomes firmer within me, the older I grow—the *Bible* must do the principal part*."

It is my humble purpose in this paper, with such helps as I have and will indicate, to attempt a study of missions in the light of the Bible, an inquiry after the foundations of the missionary structure and the springs of missionary life, a connected view of some of the leading and most obvious missionary thoughts of the Old and New Testament.

I. THE OLD TESTAMENT.

We shall, as a matter of course, expect to find the missionary ideas of the Old Testament conformed, in expression, scope and aim, to the character and purpose of the Old Dispensation in its relation to the New. As "the *unity* of

*Warneck, Missionsstunden I, p. xv.

the Old and New Testaments must not be understood as *identity*,"* so the counsel of God unto man's salvation, whilst it is eternal and essentially *one* and declared as such in both Testaments, is neither expressed nor carried out in the same manner in both. The difference between the missionary thoughts of the Old Testament and those of the New is the difference between prophecy and fulfillment, between preparation and completion. Israel's mission was fulfilled in Jesus Christ. The Israelite was not held responsible for the conversion of the world, though it was God's purpose and promise that from Israel should go forth He who is to be given "for a light to the Gentiles, that Thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." Is. 49, 6. The mission of the Church of Israel differed from the mission of the Christian Church as the office of the prophets differed from that of the apostles. This difference has been thus tersely stated by Paul Cassel: "The prophet standeth, the apostle goeth"—(Der Prophet ſteht, der Apoſtel geht.) The prophet was charged to *stand* guard—a watchman on Zion's walls. Christ's "marching orders" to His apostles were: "*Go* ye into all the world." The prophets† had a message to be delivered to God's chosen people. The apostles were the bearers of a message to be proclaimed to all mankind.

Yet this prophetic and preparatory character of the missionary thoughts of the Old Testament, so far from weakening the force of the biblical argument of missions, actually strengthens it by revealing the deep foundations, the limitless expanse and the unfailing wisdom of the gracious counsels of God. His will is that none should perish, but that all men might come to a knowledge of the truth and live. This is the united testimony of the Old and New Testament. And hence not only the specific commands of Christ recorded in the Gospels, but the missionary

---

* Oehler's Old Testament Theology—Day, p. 19.

† With the single exception of Jonah.

purposes of God that underlie and pervade His whole economy of salvation, lay upon us the sacred obligation to make that salvation known unto the ends of the earth. Let us now, by way of example, notice several of these fundamental and essential missionary ideas of the Old Testament.

1. *The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man.*—The first missionary idea of the Bible is that implied in the creation of man. All mankind has a common origin. It was designed, too, that all men should have a common destiny, having been created in the image of God. Their dispersion over the habitable globe and division into separate and distinct nations and races in no wise nullify the fact and implications of the blood-relationship of all nations. This truth forms an essential link in St. Paul's argument before the superstitious men of Athens. The haughty Greek may disdain association with the Jew, and the proud Jew may look down on Greek and barbarian as accursed and forever banished from the tender mercies of Jehovah, in God's sight they are alike under sin and condemnation and equally in need of His salvation. What the heathen are utterly ignorant of and the Jews have forgotten or misinterpreted, is a missionary idea, fundamental both to the Mosaic and the Christian dispensations: God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Acts 17, 26.

The consciousness and recollection of this truth implied in the creation of the human family—the kinship of all mankind—are preserved in the register of nations, Gen. 10. "With this list the book of Genesis takes leave, as it were, of mankind in general, and revelation henceforth limits itself to a single chosen race. The register of nations is intended to keep in memory the *original brotherhood of all the nations of the earth.* This is a thought beyond the reach of all antiquity, with the exception of Israel. Among the cultivated Greeks it was not till the time of Alexander the

Great, and chiefly through Stoicism, that the idea of a common world-citizenship of man found expression; for the antithesis of Greeks and barbarians was invincible. When the apostle Paul preached on the Areopagus: 'He hath made of one blood all nations of men,' he attacked the very heart of heathenism and Athenian pride."*

2. *The Patriarchal Promise.*—Gen. 12, 3: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Comp. Gen. 18, 18; 22, 18; Acts 3, 25; Gal. 3, 8. This promise, given and repeated to Abraham, is the earliest *expression* of the universal character of the kingdom of God. The Lord separates Abraham from his idolatrous kingdom and makes him the head and father of His chosen people. And whilst He seems to exercise partiality, electing and bestowing special favor on one nation in preference to all the others, He makes a declaration which both removes the suspicion that the other nations are excluded from His love and salvation, and shows how these eternal blessings are to be conferred upon them. Jehovah, as the Creator and Preserver of all mankind, is in fact the God of all nations. As yet, however, He is manifest as God and Lord only to Israel, His chosen people. And it is *through Israel* that He is to be universally known and acknowledged. It pleased the Lord, in His infinite wisdom, to prepare in this manner salvation for all the world. The patriarchal promise declares not only that salvation should be "of the Jews" (John 4, 22), but also that it should not be limited to Israel—that it should be offered to and appropriated by all nations of the earth. Undoubtedly, the Israelites had an advantage over the other nations. "Unto them were committed the oracles of God." Rom. 3, 1. 2. Theirs is "the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came." Rom. 9, 4. 5. But

* Oehler's Old Testament Theology—Day p. 57.

all these questions and prerogatives were committed unto Israel to the end not only that Israel might be saved, but "that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ." Gal. 3, 14. In the midst of Israel it was that God prepared His salvation "before the face of *all people*; a Light to lighten the Gentiles." Luke 2, 31. 32. "With this end and consummation in view the entire history of Israel was planned and directed, as St. Paul, the great Apostle to the Gentiles, has clearly demonstrated to the world, particularly in his epistle to the Galatians. The Jewish people, indeed, lost sight of this aim and, regarding themselves as the exclusively elect people of God, haughtily despised the heathen; but in so doing they only condemned themselves and disregarded their world-wide mission, without being able to annul the divine promise of blessing given to Abraham."*

It is an interesting and profitable question for contemplation and study: "In what relation, according to the Old Testament, do the *heathen* stand to the kingdom of God?" On the ground of such passages as Jer. 10, 25 (Comp. Ps. 79, 6. 7.); Mal. 1, 2; Is. 43, 3. 4, (Comp. Prov. 11, 8; 21, 18), some have attributed to the Old Testament the doctrine that the heathen, as such, are objects of divine wrath, that they are under God's displeasure *on account of not being Jews.* This view, based on a misapprehension of the prophecies and denunciations with respect to the heathen, was held by the Pharisees and Jews generally and resulted in their haughty particularism and implacable contempt of the heathen as such. In point of fact, however, that which subjects the heathen nations to the wrath and judgments of the God of Israel is not only their rejection of God and idolatry, the folly and worthlessness of which they might have perceived (Is. 40, 17 ff; 41, 23. 24; Jer. 10, 8 ff; Ps. 115, 4–8, etc),

*Die Mission in der Schule. Ein Handbuch fuer den Lehrer. Von G. Warneck. Fifth edition, page 21.

but particularly their bitter *enmity toward Israel*, the covenant people of God, and that which this enmity implied—*hatred toward Israel's God.* On the other hand, whilst Israel's election and adoption are conditional (Jer. 18, 7–17), the long-suffering of God extends also over the heathen, and His desire that they too might live moves Him to give them space for repentance. Compare Jer. 18, 7–10 and the Book of Jonah.

3. *Missionary thoughts and utterances in the Psalms.*—This devotional book of the Old Testament, in which the grandeur and glory of Israel's worship in private and public services are reflected, abounds in missionary sentiments and declarations of the clearest and most comprehensive character. They are inculcated and expressed in descriptions of the universal kingdom of the Lord of glory, (Ps. 24, 47, 66,); in lofty flights of praise and adoration in view of the great and all-pervading majesty and goodness of God, (Ps. 96, 100, 117, &c.); in the voluntary desire of the highly blest worshiper to proclaim the praises of Jehovah among the heathen. (Ps. 18, 49; 57, 9–11, &c.); in direct invitations and exhortations to declare among the heathen the works of might and mercy which Jehovah has done on behalf of His chosen people, as, for example, Ps. 96, 3. 10: "Declare His glory among the heathen, His wonders among all people. . . . . Say among the heathen that the Lord reigneth"; compare Ps. 9, 11; 105, 1; &c. And finally the hope and assurance are expressed, that "all the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee." Ps. 22, 27; comp. 72, 8–11; 86, 9. Verily, in view of such clear and unmistakable revelation of the saving purposes, gracious designs and world-wide scope of Jehovah's kingdom, it is difficult to understand how the Jews could use their matchless Psalter intelligently and reverently, and still persist in their bigoted fanaticism with reference to the hope of the heathen world. The same may be said also with reference to

4. *The missionary declarations of the prophets and Israel's hope of the Messiah.*—In the language of Dr. Warneck*: "The Messianic prophecy runs like a golden thread through the entire revelation of the Old Testament. In their superficiality and narrowness the Jewish people put upon this prophecy not only a decidedly material construction, as though it had reference to the establishment of a political world-kingdom, but also an intensely national construction, as though the promised Messiah should be a king exclusively of the Jews. This misconception is refuted not only, nor in the first instance, by the fulfilment recorded in the New Testament, but by the prophecy itself of the Old Testament." I am not prepared to attempt a classification or extended exposition of the missionary thoughts presented by the prophets. But it seems to me that two classes of passages are specially distinguishable: *a*) Those which pertain to the extension of the kingdom of God in the fulness of time, when the patriarchal promise shall be fulfilled; for example, Deut. 18, 15–18, where a Prophet is promised who, like Moses, shall be the mediator of a covenant, and that a new, spiritual covenant, distilling blessings upon all nations, (comp. Jer. 31, 31–34; Joel 2, 28. 32; Acts 3, 22–26; Heb. 12, 18–24.); Amos 9, 11. 12, a remnant of the heathen rescued from judgment; Is. 60, 1–11, all the most precious possessions of the Gentiles conduce to the glory of the divine kingdom; Hag. 2, 7, "the desire of all nations," or according to Luther: "aller Heiden Trost," Moreover, there are b) prophecies that pertain specially to the part which Israel is called to perform in this extension of the kingdom, e. g., Is. 2, 2. 3; Mic. 4, 1. 2, all nations going to Zion, to receive there the divine law as the rule of their lives. The mission of Israel to be the medium of revelation to all mankind, is set forth particularly in the latter part of the prophecy of Isaiah, chaps. 40

* Die Mission in der Schule, page 22.

to 66. The "Servant" of Jehovah here spoken of (comp Matt. 12, 18–21) shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles;' "the isles shall wait for His law;" He is given for a "light of the Gentiles, to open the blind eyes," etc. 42, 1. 4. 6. 7; He is in the highest sense God-sent, as He declares: "The Lord God, and His Spirit, hath sent," 48, 16, and "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; He hath sent me to bind up," etc. 61, 1. Of Him it is said: "It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; *I will give Thee for a Light to the Gentiles*, that Thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." 49, 6. This mission of Christ His apostles began to execute, and hence they felt justified in applying to themselves (Acts 13, 47) the charge that refers primarily to Christ Himself.

Franz Delitzsch concludes a brief essay on "The Fulfilment of Israel's Mission in Jesus Christ" with the following words:* "In Him, the Son of Israel, was the apostolic mission of Israel accomplished. Whether the "Servant" of God in the passages referred to be taken in a collective or a personal sense,—the case remains unchanged, the history of Israel affords no fulfillment of the prophecies except that which is offered in Jesus. A fulfillment yet to occur, which should surpass that afforded in Him, is inconceivable."

We, who read the Old Testament in the light of the New and the prophecies in the light of their fulfillment, are in a position not only to understand and appreciate the comprehensive character of those prophetic utterances, so that to our view the Messianic prophecies blossom into missionary promises, but also to trace the essential missionary idea in all the ways and ordinances and dispensations by which God made known and accomplished His gracious

*Jahrbuch der Saechs. Missions Konferenz, 1889, p. 89.

counsel and will respecting man's salvation. We need to study not simply the commands and promises and direct instructions of the Bible—the *loci classici* of missions—, but also the manner in which the missionary plan and purpose of God interpenetrates, supports and strengthens the whole structure of divine Revelation from foundation to turret. And the more nearly and fully our contemplation thus embraces the biblical view—God's view—of missions, the grander will the cause appear to us, and the more ardently will we give ourselves to the work.

II. THE NEW TESTAMENT.

All hopes and expectations awakened by the prophecies of the Old Testament with reference to the Messiah are fulfilled and realized in the record of the New Testament. The fulness of time is come (Eph. 1, 10; 1 Tim. 2, 6), and He, in whom was wrapped up, upon whom was dependent the redemption of Jews and Gentiles alike, has appeared. He came upon earth, the "Light of the world." Since Christ, at His very entrance into the world, appears as the author and soul, the beginning and end of missions, how could it be otherwise than that the record of His life and death, His words and works, His redemption accomplished and salvation wrought out, should be teeming with missionary thoughts? The missionary hopes and prophecies of the Old Testament have become missionary charges and realizations in the New. From whatever point of view, according to whatever plan or line of thought, the New Testament be studied, whether we pursue in order the great events in the work of redemption as they are commemorated by the Church Festivals, or contemplate the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, or consider the words and utterances of Jesus from the beginning of His earthly ministry to the deliverance of the Great Commission on Mt. Olivet, or ponder the practical execution of the Master's will and command as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles and, in part also, in

their epistles,—in any case the missionary idea will be found to be not only a prominent factor, but a fundamental and essential principle in the conception, elaboration and execution of the counsel of God unto man's salvation.

I have endeavored to draw up a brief summary of the principal missionary thoughts of the New Testament. It lays no claim either to thoroughness or scientific classification, but is merely intended to be suggestive and stimulating to further research and study. I have arranged these thoughts under four heads, establishing and illustrating each with characteristic passages.

1. *The Gospel of Jesus offers salvation—deliverance from sin and eternal life—to all men on the same terms: Christianity is designed to be the common religion of all the nations of the earth.*

This idea, so clear and theoretically familiar to us now, so firmly intrenched in the very heart of the Gospel and underlying the essential tenets of the Christian faith, was *new* in the time of Christ—new and incredible both to Jews and to Gentiles. By patient and persistent instruction the Lord endeavored to train His disciples and prepare them to comprehend and receive this fundamental truth. They did not comprehend it and were not prepared to act on it until some time after Pentecost. It was by a miraculous interposition and providence of the Lord that Peter and the other apostles and brethren were prepared to glorify God in view of the truth: "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." Acts 10 and 11. Not that their ears were deaf to the numerous prophecies of the Old Testament with reference to the salvation of the other nations, but they had continued in ignorance of the fact that the redemption of Christ had removed the wall of partition for Jews and Gentiles alike, that the ceremonial law with all its ordinances was no longer in force, but was abrogated. And the idea of a common, universal religion was still further removed from the conception and practice of the heathen nations. Each nation had a religion peculiar to itself, and the gods whom

it owned and served were so national in spirit, so jealous of its own selfish interests as to be regarded as inimical to other nations.

The Lord Himself paved the way for the establishment and realization of this *divine* truth of the infinite love of God that passeth knowledge. He caused it to be declared and repeated in every shade and form, from every point of view, by precept and example, throughout the New Testament Scriptures. The idea of missions, *foreign* as well as *home* missions,—missions round the globe as the natural and necessary response to the impartiality and universality of God's love and Christ's redemption—this idea is not an accidental mark or qualification, but an essential, integral part of the Gospel. This truth, as a *principle*, is doubtless familiar to us all. But how about the practice of it? Has it taken possession of our hearts as a *living* principle? Let us briefly examine its development in the New Testament.

a) It is displayed in the Savior's life—including His words and deeds—from His birth to His ascension and the fulfilment of His pentecostal promise. Let them pass in rapid review before us. The Christmas Gospel proclaims "good tidings of *great joy* which shall be to *all people.*" Luke 2, 10. Simeon is inspired to testify of Him and to declare "Thy salvation which Thou hast prepared before the face of *all people;* a Light to lighten the *Gentiles.*" Luke 2, 30–32. The missionary promise is carried speedily into effect, and Gentiles (wise men from the East) come to His light. Matt. 2, 1–12. The "Angel of the Lord," the forerunner and herald of Christ bears testimony of Him and points Him out as "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of *the world.*" John 1, 29. This is simply the announcement—the introduction, as it were, of Him, who is come to be "the Light of the nations."—Then glance at the sayings and parables of Jesus, or rather, *study* them until the missionary spirit which glows in them burns and beams within your own soul. In connection with the healing of

the centurion's servant the Lord utters a memorable prophecy, whose promise and threat have been fulfilled before the eyes of all the world: "I say unto you, that many shall come from the East and West, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness." Matt. 8, 11. 12. He called the attention of His disciples to "*the harvest*" that was "*plenteous*," that waved at their feet and stretched away to distant climes, and to the "fields—*white* already to *harvest*." Matt. 9, 37; John 4, 35. When He likened the kingdom of heaven to "a grain of *mustard seed*," and unto "*leaven*," and "unto a *net* that was cast into the *sea*," Matt. 13, 31. 33. 47, He declared both the vital and vitalizing energy, the purifying, transforming, saving power of the Gospel, and the rapid growth, the world-wide extent of missions. His declaration in the parable of the tares: "*The field is the world*," (Matt. 13, 38) has been the subject of endless controversy and contention in the Church; but one of its clear implications is indisputable, its missionary trend is plain and unmistakable: "No narrower term (than 'world') would have sufficed for Him, in whose prophetic eye the word of the Gospel was contemplated as going forth into all lands, as seed scattered in every quarter of the great outfield of the nations."* The same idea is forcibly expressed in His beautiful delineation of Himself as the Good Shepherd and of His relation to the sheep that are His: "And *other sheep* I have which are *not of this fold;* them also I *must bring*, and they *shall hear my voice;* ("your labor is not in vain in the Lord," 1 Cor. 15, 58) and there shall be *one fold*, and *one Shepherd*." John 10, 16. In the parable of the great supper, Luke 14, 16–24, "the streets and lanes of the city", with their poor and maimed and halt and blind, and "the highways and hedges", point clearly to the wretched condition of the heathen, many of

*Archbishop Trench, Parables of our Lord, p. 93.

whom, under the "compulsion" of divine love, shall partake of the supper of the Lamb. The joy over the finding of a lost sheep and a lost coin (Luke 15, 3–10) is set forth as an illustration of the joy in heaven, in the presence of the angels of God, "over one sinner that repenteth." The cause of the joy is the rescue not of a particular sinner or of a special kind or class of sinners, but — broadly and indefinitely—of *any* sinner, of *every* sinner. "God is no respecter of persons." Acts 10, 34. In the parable of the prodigal son, or more accurately, the "two sons", the course of the Gentiles and that of the Jews are aptly and forcibly illustrated by the description of the younger and the elder son respectively. When the goal of His earthly life was near at hand, in His closing addresses to His disciples the Lord spake not in parables, but plainly, the promise that had been fulfilling ever since, toward the fulfilment of which we too are called to contribute: "This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Matt. 24, 14; comp. 26, 13. Thus did the Master instruct and discipline His disciples toward the point of comprehending in some measure. The divine purpose and aim which He concentrated and crystallized in the grand and solemn charge, which the brave Duke of Wellington, in a time of missionary indifference and indolence, called the "marching orders" of the Church: "Go ye," etc., Matt. 28, 19. 20; Mark 16, 15; Acts 1, 8.

And as a missionary promise is embodied in the Christmas Gospel, announcing the Savior's birth, so we find the same idea pervading the saving deeds of God, the historic truths of redemption, which are commemorated by the other great festivals of the church year. The missionary idea of Good Friday is expressed, for example, in 1 John 2, 2; that of Easter and Ascension, Phil. 2, 9–11; that of Pentecost, Acts 2, 5. 11.

b). The grand missionary thought which we have thus traced in the life-work and personal sayings of the Savior comes to light with equal force and splendor in the contemplation of the cardinal doctrines of salvation, as embodied in the Œcumenical Confessions of the Church. Merely by way of illustration let us take a line of thought with reference to the fundamental doctrines of (1) God, (2) Man, (3) Christ. Upon the fact that there is *one God*, and He a God of love, whose earnest will it is that all men should be saved, (1 Tim. 2, 4. 5; John 3, 16; 2 Pet. 3, 9, etc.), that there is one human family "*of one blood*", in "like condemnation", "sold under sin", (Acts 17, 26; 10, 34. 35; Rom. 3, 22. 23; 3, 20; 3, 28; 10, 12; etc.), and that there is *one Mediator* between God and men, in whom there is salvation for all, in whom alone there is salvation for any, (John 14, 6; Acts 4, 12; 1 Tim. 2, 5, etc.)—upon this fact rests, and from this fact necessarily follows the cause of universal missions. The doctrine of justification by faith leads directly to the same conclusion. If there is salvation in Christ alone, and this salvation can be apprehended only by faith, it follows first, that salvation is certainly wrought out and prepared for all, because all *can* believe ("whosoever"—John 3, 16); and secondly, that Christ must be preached to all, for "faith cometh by hearing", and those who are saved *must* believe—there is no other way of attaining to salvation. The Lutheran Church is foremost among the churches of Christendom in holding in its purity and entirety this central doctrine of the Gospel. Why is she not foremost in carrying out the necessary sequence of the doctrine—the preaching of the Gospel of the Kingdom in all the world?

2. *The Church, a Missionary Institute and Centre: every disciple a missionary; every believer, a laborer together with God.*

It is the Lord's will that His Gospel should be preached and His Kingdom spread *through the instrumentality of men.* "I will make *you* fishers of men." Matt. 4, 19. "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I *you.*" John 20, 21.

"*Ye* shall be witnesses unto me," Acts 1, 8. Thus our Lord addressed disciples. St. Paul calls himself and his brethren in the ministry "laborers together with God," 1 Cor. 3, 9; and the entire "Church of the living God" he terms "the pillar and ground of the truth," 1 Tim. 3, 15, both firmly founded, that the gates of hell may not prevail against her, and highly elevated, so that the light of the Gospel entrusted to her may shine far out into the world. To confess Christ, to testify of Him, is the chief calling of disciples in this world. To forego this privilege, to fail in performing this duty, is not only to deny the Lord who bought them, but to contradict the nature of believers and evince the hollowness of their professions. That those who are without may be won,—this is urged not only by St. Paul, but throughout the New Testament as one of the chief motives to Christian virtue and holiness. Matt. 5, 16; Eph. 4, 28; 1 Pet. 2, 9. 12, etc.

"The Church of God exists not only as a *rallying*, but as a *radiating* centre. It is indeed a home, but also a school; a place for worship, but not less for work. For a society of disciples to be engrossed even in self-culture is fatal to service and even to true sanctity. The Church is no gymnasium, where exercise is the law, and self-development the end. The field is the world, and the sower and reaper, while at work for a harvest, each gets in his exertion the very exercise which is needful to growth. . . . . This law of church life must be constantly kept before believers, enforced and emphasized by repetition, that upon every believer is laid the duty of personal labor for the lost. This conviction must be beaten in and burned in, until the goal is seen to be, not salvation or even sanctification (for their own sake), but service to God and man in saving souls."*

Doubtless the rapid spread of Christianity in the times of the apostles was largely due to the fact that every disciple

* Dr. A. T. Pierson, in address before the London Missionary Conference, 1888. Report Vol. II, p. 490.

was a witness for Christ, telling others, wherever they went, of Him in whom their souls had found peace. And the Lord blessed their simple, but hearty testimony unto the salvation of many. Acts 11, 18–21; compare 13, 49; 19, 10.

As the love of God is the foundation and source of missions, so it is also the *impelling motive*—the only adequate motor—to missionary enterprise. Christ's explicit command enforces mission work as a *duty*. But the fulfilment of that duty presupposes and requires something more and higher than the mere sense of obedience to divine command. Without a higher motive the duty will either be performed mechanically and in a mercenary spirit rendering the service worthless and displeasing to God, or it will be sadly neglected and left undone. When "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us," Rom. 5, 5, then will we be impelled to spread the salvaion of the Lord from the same motive that constrained God to prepare it. God *so loved* the world that He sent His only begotten Son to save it. And every child of God, every true believer can truly testify with St. Paul in reference to the work he does in the kingdom of God: "The love of Christ constraineth us," 2 Cor. 5, 14, meaning thereby not only his love to Christ, but also and chiefly Christ's love to him. When this divine love has taken possession of a person's heart, it moves, nay, constrains and compels him to be a follower of Christ in the performance of works of love.

3. *The principal means and instrumentalities, to be depended on and resorted to, in the prosecution of missionary enterprises.* The thoughts and instructions of the New Testament on this subject may be summed up under two heads; First, *fervent prayer;* secondly, *personal labor*, the specific character of which will conform to each one's talents and opportunities. The length to which our essay is growing forbids our entering into details. A few references and illustrations may suffice for our purpose.

That prayer — earnest, fervent, believing, persevering prayer — is of *first importance, the chief dependence, support and resort* in the doing of the Lord's work, is evident from the emphasis laid upon it by Christ and His apostles. Take, for example, His injunction to *prayer for laborers.* Matt. 9, 37. 38. There is indeed a deep mystery connected with prayer and its divine answer, — a mystery that baffles the scrutiny of human reason and can be embraced only by a humble, childlike faith. But the very fact that the Lord makes the progress of His Kingdom contingent upon the prayers of His people shows the *extraordinary significance* of believing prayer, and the *tremendous responsibility* thus imposed upon us. And it is certainly worthy of our earnest reflection that our Lord has designated just that wherein we are chiefly lacking to-day — the want of laborers — as the object, the *principal* object of our prayers! — Then, look at the Lord's Prayer. Three of the seven petitions have for their direct and immediate object the extension of the Lord's Kingdom throughout the world.—The frequency with which St. Paul, the great missionary to the Gentiles, entreats His brethren "at home": "Pray for us," is full of significance and food for thought. And then take, finally, his grand, comprehensive and well established exhortation to prayer, 1 Tim. 2, 1–7. How limitless the scope of the Christian's prayer, how firm the foundation on which it rests! And this missionary service, the apostle declares, we should render "*first of all.*" The most experienced, the most laborious of missionaries designates *prayer* as the *first, principal, divinely approved instrumentality* for the prosecution of universal missions. But let it not be overlooked that it is prayer in the *sense* and *spirit* of *Christ* and *St. Paul* that is required.

Prayer must be followed and accompanied by *work*, as work must be imbued with and upheld by prayer. And, as already pointed out, the obligation to render service is laid on every disciple. Whoever enters the Kingdom of God — the Lord's vineyard — comes in not only as a branch to be

cultivated, but as a husbandman to labor. Let the parable of the pounds be well pondered. (Luke 19, 12–26.) The pound which is entrusted to every servant or laborer, which each one is to *use* that it may be effective and fruitful in the Lord's service, which is to "occupy" every one's time and strength till the Lord come, is the sum of divine gifts and blessings contained in God's Word. This Word must be preached throughout the world for a testimony unto all nations. This is the *sum of the work* to be done, and every servant must determine for himself what *specific part* of the work he is, in the Lord's providence, fitted and called to perform.—Keeping in view the Lord's commission, "Go ye," some will find it to be their privilege and duty to *go*, giving themselves personally to the work of the ministry at home or abroad. Others will go by proxy, *sending* laborers into the field and helping to sustain them in the work. And that this principal part of the work may be vigorously prosecuted, a great deal of subordinate service must be rendered. Knowledge of missions must be extended, information spread, offerings gathered. laborers (missionaries in the strict sense) must be won, prepared and sent forth, &c. Blessed is he who, attentive to the Lord's will, finds his proper place in the service, and then, redeeming the time, serving with singleness and faithfulness of heart, makes the most of it for the salvation of man and the glory of God! On the other hand,—and no *conscientious pastor* will fail to examine himself and his service in the light of the searching Word: "*Woe to them that are at ease in Zion!*" Amos 6, 1; and "*Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord negligently!*" Jer. 48, 10. R. V.

4. *Money and the Kingdom.*—Our exposition of the principal missionary thoughts of the New Testament would be radically defective without an allusion, at least, to the true relation of money to missionary enterprise. This subject is so important, so essential to the extension of the Lord's Kingdom without, and so fundamental to the life of that

Kingdom within the soul, that it deserves special study and extended reflection. The general principle of Christian stewardship—the relation between the Christian and his temporal possessions—is, as a matter of theory, familiar to us and not unknown to our people. But what shall we say about the practical application of this vital principle? We think the language of a late writer is none too strong. He says: The general acceptance on the part of the church of the doctrines of God's Word touching possessions "would involve a reformation scarcely less important in its results than the great Reformation of the sixteenth century. What is needed is not simply an increased giving, an enlarged estimate of the 'Lord's share', but a *radically different conception* of our relations to our possessions. Most Christian men need to discover that they are not proprietors, apportioning their own, but simply trustees or managers of God's property. All Christians would admit that there is a sense in which their all belongs to God, but deem it a very poetical sense, wholly unpractical and practically unreal. The great majority treat their possessions exactly as they would treat property, use their substance exactly as if it were their own."*

In view of the depleted state of our synodical treasuries, and the beggarly contributions of many of our congregations, I make bold to raise the question: Are we pastors making full proof of our ministry and rightly dividing the Word of truth as regards the principle that lies so near the heart of the soul's spiritual life, upon the application and enforcement of which so much depends for time and for eternity—the principle, so clearly enunciated and repeatedly affirmed both in the Old and New Testament, that not only our soul and body, but our substance, too, belongs to God,

---

* "Our Country" by Dr. Josiah Strong, p. 182 f. This book I consider the most soul-stirring contribution to the cause of Home Missions I have ever read. Fifty cents in cloth binding, twenty-five cents in paper.

and that every part of it is to be used in such way as will, according to an earnest and honest purpose, best contribute to His glory? If there is any part of our message that must, if necessary, "be beaten in and burned in"—the squirming of "old Adam" to the contrary notwithstanding—I believe it is this. I utterly fail to understand the timidity of some pastors in presenting to their people and urging upon them the Lord's claim upon their purses. Let those who are disposed to raise a hue and cry about what they are pleased to term "this eternal begging", let them read their New Testament carefully through just once, with a view to learning what the Lord Jesus and His apostles say on the subject. They will be surprised, nay, amazed to discover how very many things our blessed Savior had to say on this theme. From His Sermon on the Mount till His last discourse to the people His teachings abound in instructions, exhortations, warnings and commands, relating to temporal possessions, their use and misuse, their perils and deceitfulness, their intimate relation to the moral character and the spiritual life. Let me, by way of example, indicate a few passages: Matt. 5, 42; 6, 19–34; Mark 10, 23. 24; Luke 12, 15. Then take the parables: the sower; the unmerciful servant; the wicked husbandman; the unjust steward; the talents; the pounds; the good Samaritan; the rich fool; the rich man and Lazarus, teaching how we may sin and what we may reap in the hoarding of money; and the prodigal son, teaching the sin and folly of squandering it. And, finally, let the account of the final judgment be earnestly pondered. What is the exact element on which the decision turns? Not the cry, "Lord, Lord," not pious professions or pretentions of orthodoxy; but the "fruits of the Spirit" *works of love* as manifestations of a *living faith in a living Redeemer—or their absence!*

Let me, in closing this study, quote the words of Rev. Forrest Emerson, in a stirring address* before the London

* Reports of the Conference, Vol. II., p. 496 ff.

Missionary Conference on "The responsibility of Wealth for the success of Christian Missions."

"Missions cannot be carried forward without money; and when it is remembered that this is not only true as an abstract statement, but that all our Societies are in need of money to man properly the fields already opened,—when from many new quarters comes the cry, 'Come over and help us,' but the Societies are unable to work their forces into new fields for lack of funds; and when, too, our great wealth in England and America is taken into account, it will be seen that the consideration of Christ's teachings as to money and the implied necessity of the consecration of wealth are of the utmost importance in our churches." Mutatis mutandis —does not this apply exactly and forcibly to the affairs of our household? EDW. PFEIFFER.

THE SEED AND THE SOIL.

That the preaching of the Gospel does not produce the same effect upon all hearers is a fact of universal experience. No one denies it. Some are converted, and some are not; some who are converted continue steadfast unto the end and are saved, and some fall away and finally perish. It is quite natural that Christian minds should be moved to inquire into the causes of a fact involving such vast interests. Easy methods of explanation have been devised. A large party has maintained that everything is dependent on the exercise of natural power in human choice, and that when the offer of salvation is made some, for reasons satisfactory to themselves, reject it, while others, for reasons equally satisfactory to themselves, accept it. The same is alleged to be the case in regard to perseverance: some find reason to abandon the Christian faith, and decide accordingly; others see good ground for steadfastly pursuing their chosen goal, and therefore resolve to continue faithful unto death and to

lay hold on eternal life. Another party takes a diametrically opposite course. Its adherents maintain that God determines all by His irrevocable decree, and that man has nothing whatever to do with it. According to their theory some, when the Gospel is preached, believe it because God has decreed that they shall believe it, and by His power works His will in their souls, so that they cannot otherwise than believe it, and some do not believe it because there is no power in human nature to believe, and the necessary grace is not given them to supply the power; and He sees to it that those whom He has resolved to save, persevere unto the end, while those who are not elect are not kept by the power of God and must fall and perish. Both ways are easy and simple, and both, so far as solving the immediate problem is concerned, are satisfactory to reason. But both have insuperable difficulties in another direction. They contradict the Scriptures, and lead to consequences that are subversive of the whole revealed plan of salvation. Pelagianism tramples upon the words of God which ascribe all to grace; Calvinism tramples upon all those words of God which give exhortation and warning to men and lay the responsibility on their souls. Each emphasizes a truth which the other ignores, and each, resting in a partial truth to the denial of the other part, preaches a system of falsehood; just as when one party urges the truth that there is but one God to the denial of the Trinity, and another party urges the truth that the Father is God and the Son is God and the Holy Ghost is God to the denial of the Divine Unity. Such evasions of divine truth, though it be with the appearance of great reverence for one class of texts, may mislead some souls and establish a sect, but the error, though a half-truth, can never be the doctrine of the Christian Church.

Our Lord Himself, in the parable of the sower, described the different sorts of hearers. His words were not designed to explain the cause of the manifest difference. They do not directly refer to that feature. They were designed to

point out certain characteristics of classes into which hearers may be arranged, that those who preach might be prepared for varied results, and those who hear might have a guide for self-examination. But just on this account the parable and its explanation, as given by our Lord Himself, throws light incidentally on the grounds of the difference.

It must be remarked in the very outset, that manifestly our Lord does not mean to illustrate His various dealings with men, but rather the various attitudes which men assume towards the Word which He preaches and commissions others to preach. The whole parable would have taken a different course if it had been designed to exhibit distinctions which God makes among men; and in that case, while it would still have been profitable for doctrine, it would not be applicable for exhortation or warning.

The parable is recorded by Matthew chap. 13, 1–15 and 18–23, Mark chap. 4, 1–25, and Luke chap. 8, 4–18. In its main features it runs as follows: A sower went out to sow his seed. Some of this fell by the way side, where it was trodden under foot and the birds came and devoured it. Some fell on a rock, where it had not much earth and where it sprang up soon, but also soon withered in the sun, because it had no room for roots and no earth for moisture. Some fell in thorny places and the thorns grew with it and choked it, so that it could yield no fruit. And some fell on good ground and brought forth from thirty to a hundred fold. The interpretation, in general, is this: Our Lord sows the seed of His Word on earth. Some of this falls on hearts that are like the way side, where the truth is trampled down and the devil takes it away, as the birds eat up the grain that lies in the road. Some of it falls on souls that are like the shallow soil that thinly covers a rock: they soon show signs of life, but when temptations come, like the burning rays of the sun on rootless blades, they have nothing to sustain them, and forthwith fall away, as the moistureless plants droop and die in the scorching heat.

Some of it falls on souls that are like the patches of ground which are preoccupied by thorns and thistles: the seed of the Word grows, but the cares and riches and pleasures of the world grow also and choke the Word, so that there is nothing yielded but a crop of thorns. Some of it, finally, falls on hearts that are like good soil: they hear and understand the Word and bring forth fruit in patience.

But plain as these general features are, there is much that challenges special consideration.

I. In regard to the seed there are several important features that should be particularly noted. One of these is that the seed is the Word of God; another is that the life and power are in the seed, not in the soil; a third is that the seed sown is the same, notwithstanding the diversities in the results.

1. The preaching of the Gospel is represented by the sowing of the seed. That which is preached is the Word of God. Nothing else is contemplated in the parable. Hirelings may scatter other seeds than those which the proprietor of the land desires to have sown. They may disregard the orders that are given them. This is sometimes done in farmers' material fields by wicked or careless servants; it is often done in the Lord's spiritual field by wicked or careless ministers. Many a one sows tares instead of wheat, and in his blindness is satisfied with the weeds that grow instead of grain. The Church has suffered from the beginning, and suffers now, from the scattering of human opinions, which have no regenerating power in them, instead of the Word of God which quickens and saves. But it is obvious that in our parable the Lord has in view what He has commanded to be sown and what ought to be sown. "The seed is the Word of God." He is speaking only of that. Whatever fruit is brought forth is owing to this Word; whatever lack of fruit there may be is a lack notwithstanding the sowing of this Word.

2. The seed of the Word has all the power in it to produce the results designed. The life is not in the soil, but in the seed. That must germinate and bring forth the fruit. And such power is expressly predicated of the Word which is represented by the seed. It has life in it, as all seed must have life in it if it is to grow. But the Word has more. It has the power to impart life. The soil upon which it falls could yield no fruit if the spiritual seed did not convey as well as contain spiritual life. "The words that I speak unto you," says our Lord, "they are spirit, and they are life." John 6, 63. "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ," says St. Paul, "for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1, 16. And again it is written: "The Word of God is quick and powerful." Heb. 4, 12. Therefore it produces such great effects upon those who hear and believe, not only living in them, but imparting life to them. Accordingly St. Paul writes: "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the Word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the Word of man, but as it is in truth, the Word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." 1 Thess. 2, 13. St. Peter also exhorts: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." 1 Pet. 1, 22. 23. And St. James declares: "Of His own will begat He us with the Word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of His creatures." "Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted Word, which is able to save your souls." James 1, 18. 21. Men are spiritually dead in trespasses and sins, and God alone can give them life and enable them to bear fruit. The Spirit does this, and does it by means of the Word.

3. That Word is the same in all cases, whatever differences may appear in the fruit. The parable is not designed to show how different seeds yield different fruits. All that is yielded is of the same sort. Some yield much, some little, some nothing; but they do not yield different kinds of fruit. The differences are owing to the soil, not to the seed. It is important to note this. The parable teaches us how men hinder the work of the Lord, not how variously the Lord deals with men in the offer of life and the importation of saving power. The seed that fell by the way side and on the rock and among the thorns was the same seed that fell upon good ground, and it had the same life and the same power in it. It was the Word of God that is quick and quickens, that is, that has life and gives life. The design of the sower is in all cases the same, that this quick and powerful seed should bear much fruit. That it fails in any case is not attributable to His will or to any failure on His part to furnish the requisite efficacy, but simply and only to the absence of necessary conditions and presence of unnecessary obstructions in the soil. This is manifest not only from the nature of the elements entering into the parable and the Savior's explanation of the causes bringing about the failure to bear fruit, but also from the admonitions connected with it. "If any man have ears to hear, let him hear!" "Take heed therefore how ye hear; for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have." It is not God's fault that no fruit is borne when His Word is preached. That Word has life in it and has power to give life to all that will hear it. He gives the Word, and He has given man ears: let them hear it. And if after hearing it for a while, they become negligent and not only gain no more, but even lose what they have, is it not their own fault? No complaint could be more unreasonable than that which charges God with being a respecter of persons, who gives power by His Word to one while He withholds it from another, and

by that Word gives the grace of perseverance to one while He withholds it from another. It is not so. The Word is in all cases exactly the same life and power. Men are to blame, not God, when the seed brings forth no fruit or the plant withers. If men will not use what they have, they ill use all. The exhortation and warning which our Lord gives is based on the assumption that man may prevent the accomplishment of God's purpose in giving the Word, and that many do prevent it to their own everlasting perdition.

II. How this is done is shown by the various classes of hearers, as these are represented by the different places upon which the seed fell. Some persons to whom the Word is preached are like the way side, some like the rock, some like the thorny field, some like good ground. Only in the latter is the object of the sower attained; the rest yield no fruit or do not bring it to perfection. It is worth our while to study these different classes and endeavor to understand the difficulty.

1. In the case of those who are likened to the way side two reasons are suggested why the end is not attained. One is that the ground is hard, so that the seed can not find its way into the earth and take root, but lies on the surface and is trampled upon; the other is that, as it lay exposed, the birds picked it up and devoured it, so that it was taken away, and all growth and fruitage was rendered impossible. The two stand so intimately connected that only Luke mentions the fact that the seed was trodden down. It was trampled under foot because it fell in the roadway. But the road was trodden hard and lay outside of the field that was cultivated; therefore the seed that fell upon it was carried away by the fowls of the air. The hardness of the ground was the opportunity of the birds.

Our Savior thus teaches us that there are hearts upon which the Word of God has no effect, because they are not in the proper condition to permit its entering in and taking

root. They are like the way side upon which the sower's seed falls. This cannot penetrate the hard crust. The parable does not tell us what made the heart so hard, and it would scarcely suffice to seek these causes in analogies to the known means by which the road ways become hard. But that the Word fails to produce fruit because the heart is hard is as certain as that the seed falling on the way side did not yield fruit because the ground was hard. What made it hard is a secondary matter in the parable, and must be a secondary matter in the application. Our Lord does not refer to it in His explanation. He only points to the fact that the conditions were such as furnish easy opportunity for taking the Word away, as the birds could easily gather up and devour the seed that was lying exposed by the way side. But the hearts are represented as hard: that is a plain fact. And the hardness is not the natural condition, as the ground by the way side is not naturally in a trodden state: that much is certain. There is some other reason for it than the mere fact that sin has entered into the world. If that were all the reason to be assigned, all hearts would necessarily be like the way side. The whole parable is constructed on the assumption that influences have been at work to change the natural condition of the hearers. Some have become hardened like the way side, whatever it may have been that hardened them.

One hint is given in our Lord's explanation as reported by Matthew that helps us materially in ascertaining how this was brought about. "When any one heareth the Word of the kingdom and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart." Satan takes away the Word from the person that understandeth it not—*μὴ συνιέντος*. He hears the words, but does not in his mind connect with them the sense. That which properly constitutes the Word does not enter into his soul. Either he does not give sufficient attention to apprehend the meaning of the articulate sounds which he hears,

or if he does intellectually catch their general signification, he does not receive it as the Word of God and cordially embrace it for his learning and comfort. It does not enter into his heart and become clear through the effects produced. He hears it as the blind man hears about beautiful colors. Not having the ability to appreciate what he hears, he may not have interest enough in it to attend to the general signification of the words, or if he does apprehend this, he does not in his own soul realize what they mean. He does not understand it.

That is indeed the condition of all men as they are by nature. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. 2, 14. But not all men are in that condition after the Word is preached. "The entrance of Thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple." Ps. 119, 130. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple." Ps. 19, 8. The Word is never wholly without effect. It is light, and in its nature it must bring light wherever it falls. The only way to prevent enlightenment by it is to intercept its rays. Even the blind will be made to see by it, unless they voluntarily close their eyes against it after it has shone upon them. The Word never fails to lead the soul to Jesus and enable it to see the King in His beauty, unless it sets its will consciously and stubbornly against the will of the Lord as the Word makes it known. Therefore "whosoever hath, to him shall be given and he shall have more abundance; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath." Our parable contemplates men not as they are all alike in darkness and death, but as they are different in virtue of their personal attitude to the Word that is preached. Some have had opportunities to know the truth and have continued to resist its workings until their hearts

have become as hard as the way side and as impervious to the Gospel as the way side is to the sower's seed. The Word preached does not enter into the soul; it is not understood; it lies on the surface with no chance to take root.

"Then cometh the devil and taketh away the Word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved." That is the outcome of it. The Word has the power in it to work faith, and the divine order is that he that believeth shall be saved. But man has the fearful power to prevent the accomplishment of the divine will through the Word. He can close all the avenues of the soul against it, so that it will not produce the faith which it was designed to work and to nourish. And because men ungratefully reject the proffered grace and choose death rather than life, the devil is permitted to take the truth away from the soul and remove the only opportunity of salvation. It is a terrible truth that even believers too seldom realize in all its dreadful import, that Satan is constantly prowling about in our congregations, watching his opportunity to steal the Word away from hearer's souls, lest they should believe and be saved, and that he is always successful in the case of those who will not permit the ploughshare of the law to be run through their hardened hearts and the trodden ground to be broken up. They perish, because hardening themselves against all grace they do not understand the Word, and permit it to be taken away by the enemy of souls. "To-day, if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts." Heb. 4, 7.

2. The second class, represented by the rock upon which the seed falls, is a degree better. It is composed of hearers who have not entirely closed their hearts against the Word. The rock might at first suggest obduracy. But our Lord's explanation makes it manifest that "they on the rock" are different from the hardened hearers who are like the wayside. The Word has still some effect upon them. It does not lie merely on the surface, and is not immediately taken away. It penetrates the soil and grows. The rock is con-

ceived as having a thin layer of earth spread over it, into which the seed can enter, so that it is not exposed to the birds and may grow for a season. "Some fell upon stony places where they had not much earth, and forthwith they sprang up because they had no deepness of earth." This shows that the "stony places" (*τὰ πετρώδη*) of St. Matthew, and the "stony ground" (*τὸ πετρῶδες*) of St. Mark, do not mean land in which stones abound, but "a rock" (*τὴν πέτραν*), as it is called in St. Luke, on which there is "not much earth." Hearers are thus described who receive the Word, who even receive it with gladness, "which for a while believe, but who soon fall away." The little earth on the rock furnishes room for the seed to enter and to sprout, but is not enough to admit of deep root and to supply the necessary moisture, and therefore as soon as it sprang up it withered away under the scorching sun, "because it had no root" and "because it lacked moisture."

The condition of the persons thus described as "they on the rock" is such that they must be classed among the believers, whilst those represented by the way side belong to the unbelievers. The latter have the Word taken away out of their hearts, so that they cannot be saved; the former for a while believe, so that they would be saved if they remained in that condition, but in time of temptation they fall away and perish. These temporary believers have under the influence of the Word, passed from death unto life, but are not sufficiently rooted to withstand the temptations which beset them, and therefore pass again from life unto death.

It is obvious that our Lord would direct our attention, in contemplating this class of hearers, not only to the adverse influences by which the spiritual life is endangered. All Christians are subject to these, and if there were nothing to account for the falling away but the temptations presented by the world and the flesh and the devil, there would be no reason why some should fall and some should stand. The

grace of God, if no obstacles are put in its way, is sufficient for the perseverence of all, as the power of sin, if it is permitted to work unhindered, is sufficient for the overthrow of all. When the Word comes to men it has the power in it to convert them all, as all men have the wicked power in their nature to resist the divine power and hinder their conversion. But the power of the Word always accomplishes the divine purpose of salvation, unless there is something more to be overcome than the evil which is in human nature as such and which is common to all men. If that were an insuparable obstacle no man could be saved. But as grace can overcome that, and as the grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, and the divine will is that all should be saved, there must be something else that hinders the salvation of men. That is the personal will to which God has ordained that no violence shall be done. If men, notwithstanding the power unto salvation that comes to them in the Word, will perversely harden their hearts against it, so that they become impervious to the Word, as the beaten road is to the seed, God will not force them into heaven. So when men have become believers, the needful grace for their perseverance to the end is offered by the Word to all alike. That would secure the salvation of them all. The power of sin that is in the world would compass the destruction of them all. That neither takes place requires the consideration of something more than simply these forces in the abstract. No one falls because the grace of God is not sufficient to sustain him, and no one falls simply because the burning rays of temptation fall upon him. The temptations have something to do with it, indeed. But they bring about the fall only in some persons. There is something in their condition that renders this sad result possible, notwithstanding the sufficiency of divine grace to secure their perseverance unto the end and their final salvation. There is not the slightest hint in the parable to excuse, much less to justify the harsh thought that

God is to blame for the apostasy of these people, either because the order of His grace was such as to withhold from them the necessary gifts, or because the order of His providence was such as to allot temptations greater than they could bear. What is taught is that neither the seed nor the sun was to blame, but that the soil was at fault.

These rock hearers, though they were believers, were not such believers as those represented by the good ground. There was something lacking in them, notwithstanding that they received the Word with joy and for a while believed. They had no root; they lacked moisture; therefore they fell when the time of trial came. Such are the multitudes of Christians who disregard the admonitions to steadfastness and growth in grace, and think they are strong enough for all practical purposes and have learned enough to be secure against all the wiles of the devil. They are the people who heed not such words as those of St. Paul: "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in Him, rooted and built up in Him, and established in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving. Because lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." Col. 2, 6–8. They are the superficial Christians who are satisfied with a mere sentiment that has no solid foundation in revealed truth, that can give no reason for the bright hopes entertained, and that abandon all when the mood changes because adversities come. The truth of God has not taken root, because earnest attention has not been given it as the one thing needful, and the kingdom of God and His righteousness has not been sought first, but an easy-going religiousness has been maintained as a sentimental luxury, leaving the soul unprepared for the stern performance of duty, against which the flesh relents, and for the bitter cross which all must bear who would follow Christ. The fall comes, because the state of the soul is such, through negligence and self-indulgence,

that when adversity comes Christianity fades away from their sight with the roseate hues which they had mistaken for it, and when the cross is laid upon them the intolerable burden brings despair. "He that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the Word and anon with joy receiveth it; yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while, for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the Word, by and by he is offended."

No one can cast an earnest glance at the Christian Church without realizing, that the number of those is great who are like the seed on the rock. There are even whole sects that not only tolerate, but cultivate such a superficial Christianity, which is wholly unfit for the severe labors and trials of Christ's kingdom. Sentimentalism that has its root in unregenerated human nature is represented as the very essence of evangelical faith, because "anon with joy it receiveth" the good tidings; but because it is the present experience of the joy, not the good tidings, upon which the heart is fixed and which is appreciated, the tidings seem worthless when the tribulations come through which we must enter into the kingdom of God. Persecutions will surely come in some form and troubles will surely arise, and those who have no depth of earth and no moisture, whose souls have not been stirred to their inmost depths by the Word of God, and in whom that Word has not taken deep root, will surely fall.

3. A still further advance is made towards accomplishing the divine purpose in the case of those hearers of the Word who are likened to the thorny ground. Here the soil is cultivated and ready for the seed. It is not a hard-trodden road, neither is it a shallow covering of earth spread over a rock. The conditions of fruit-bearing are to a certain extent fulfilled. But there is a fatal hindrance. There is other seed in the ground, and it is permitted to grow and choke what is sown by the Holy Spirit. The hearers thus represented are like those on the rock, to be regarded as be-

lievers. In that respect they both differ from the wayside hearers. From these the seed is removed, and therefore germination and fruit-bearing is impossible where it fell. On the rock it grew, but the sprout died for lack of earth in which to strike root, and for lack of moisture. Among the thorns it also grew, and having earth and moisture enough it might have become a vigorous plant and yielded abundant fruit, but the thorns, which should have been eradicated, but which were permitted to grow with it, finally choked the life out of it, so that it became unfruitful. Hearers are thus described in whom the Word takes effect, who by its power become believers, but who, by neglecting the means of grace and the necessary vigilance and prayer, suffer the cares and riches and pleasures of this life to gain the ascendency in their souls and to destroy the plant of divine life that had grown from the seed of the Word. It is a solemn warning that our restless, mammon-worshiping, pleasure-seeking age has special need to take earnestly to heart.

The work of grace is not all done when the law has wrought the knowledge of sin and the gospel has brought the glad assurance that in Christ the sin that burdens the soul is forgiven. Where there is forgiveness of sin there is indeed life and salvation. But he that endureth unto the end shall be saved. The Lord calls men into His kingdom that they may enjoy His grace and do His work. These always go together. If we have known and believed the love which God hath to us, we love Him because He first loved us, and the word of our Lord is for ever in effect, "If ye love me, keep my commandments." John 14, 15. The believer is therefore moved by the Holy Spirit, on the one hand, to use diligently those means by which grace is imparted, that he may remain steadfast in the faith and be ever more zealous of good works, and on the other that he may be guarded against the opposing influences of the world and the flesh and the devil. When he ceases to place his reliance on the grace which comes by God's appointed means,

and relaxes his vigilance against the enemy of our souls, and no longer feels the necessity of seeking refuge and strength by prayer in the almighty power of God, the danger is imminent and death is not far off. And so it is when the work which God has given him to do is disregarded or disdained. That work was not designed to save the soul. It does not redeem from death; it does not appropriate the redemption which Christ alone effected; it does not produce the faith by which alone the redemption which is in Christ Jesus can be appropriated; it does not preserve the faith whose endurance to the end is necessary for our salvation. But it is the proper product of the life which divine grace has wrought in the soul, and those who resist the Holy Spirit in His work of holiness will eventually deprive themselves of the whole power of the Spirit unto faith and justification, as well as unto good works and sanctification. Those who will not live under Christ and serve Him will not be retained in His Kingdom. "Every branch in me," the Savior says, "that beareth not fruit, He taketh away; and every branch that beareth fruit, He purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the Word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches; He that abideth in me and I in Him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing." John 15, 2–5. The life which our Lord gives and which is present in our souls when we believe and while we believe in Him, brings forth its appropriate fruit to His praise and man's good; if there is no such fruit, it is because there is no life in us.

But there is more than this contained in our Lord's teaching concerning the thorny ground. He refers not only to the lack of proper growth and fruitage in the plant of His grace in the hearts of hearers, but also to the growth of weeds consequent upon the failure to cultivate the plant

which has sprung up from the seed of His Word. The thorns will spring up and thrive, to the destruction of all good fruit, if nothing is done to root them out. St. Paul's words will help us to understand our Lord's meaning: "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." Rom. 8, 13. There is in every Christian soul a conflict for supremacy between the propensities of our corrupt nature and the impulses of the new life imparted by the Holy Spirit from the fullness of Christ. "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Gal. 5, 16. 17. A true believer has the sin still remaining in his nature, and in that respect is a sinner who has daily need of the petition, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us." But as a regenerated person his will is wholly for righteousness and against the sin in himself as well as everywhere else. He hates sin and loves holiness, and therefore all the motions of sin in his own soul are against his personal will as they are against the will of God. He sins only because he "cannot do the things that he would." So completely is he, as to his governing purpose and personal resolve, under the grace of God that St. John even says: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God." 1 John 3, 9. He could in his personal purpose put himself again on the side of sin and decide in its favor by renouncing the Spirit of grace and falling away from the divine life which he has received by regeneration. There are motions of sin in his nature still becoming manifest in his consciousness. But he deplores them and resists them as elements foreign to his character as a child of God. Therefore St. Paul says: "If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that is good.

Now then it is no more I that do it, but the sin that dwelleth in me." Rom. 7, 16. 17. As long as this spiritual life continues, the struggle against the flesh, or the sin that is in us, continues also. When the conflict with sin ceases and the soul consents to let it have its course, the fall has taken place. Living after the flesh brings death; only when by the Spirit the deeds of the body are mortified can life be preserved. "When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." James 1, 15. Therefore the believer's safety lies only in not letting the flesh bear its fruit. If the lust in the soul, or original sin, receives the assent of the will, so that it can have unrestrained operation in the production of actual sin, the sin becomes wilful and brings death.

The thorny ground hearers not only fail to cultivate the Christian graces and to glorify God and bless their fellow men by doing good works, but they let the flesh bear its fruit, and that is unto death. "The cares of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the Word, and it becometh unfruitful." The mind is careful about many things. It takes thought of what we shall eat and drink and wear, and in its anxiety about these things, which our heavenly Father only can supply and which He never fails to give to His children as they need them, the kingdom of God and His righteousness, which is the one thing needful, is overlooked and neglected. Riches, with their deceitful promise of gratifying every longing of the soul, entice and entangle the unwise, and in multitudes the words of the apostle have become a matter of dreadful experience: "They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil, which, while some have coveted after, they have erred from the faith and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." 1 Tim. 6, 9. 10. Instead of laying up for themselves treasures in

heaven and in rejoicing in the hope of glory, using the blessed Word of God daily and devoutly for the better appreciation of their spiritual treasure and the more complete realization in the soul of their blessedness, the perishing treasures of earth enchant them and they make gold their God. And a goodly portion of those whom the Word has reached and blessed are deluded into the belief that, as our Lord has come to bless His people and make them forever happy, they may shun the cross and freely share all the pleasures of earth; and acting on this belief, they let the thorns of pleasure grow and choke the good seed, so that it can yield no fruit. Thus there are many to whom the word applies, that they "are lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." 2 Tim. 3, 4. 5. Many have begun well, but have perished because they disregarded the warning, "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die, but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."

We fear, and we have reason for the fear, that many to whom the care of souls is committed by that merciful Lord who cares for all, do not realize the danger to which so many are exposed through the cares and riches and pleasures of this life, and, being content to find in the people still a form of godliness, are too indolent and self-indulgent, or too greedy for praise, to warn and entreat the careless and negligent members of the church, who are manifestly letting the thorns grow and are in daily danger of dying the spiritual death. God pity such pastors, and give them less love of self and more love of souls! If believers will not themselves apply the Word incessantly, that the good plants may be watered and the weeds may be exterminated by the power of the Holy Spirit, the minister has the duty and should always have the loving impulse to run to the rescue. Save what can be saved, and give nothing up for lost until every effort has been made to save. "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore

hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die, and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life, the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at thine hand." Ezek. 3, 17. 18. The parable of the sower is written for the learning of pastors as well as of hearers.

4. Finally, there are some in whom the Word produces its intended effects. They are likened to good ground in which the seed can grow unobstructed and which yields fruit. "He that received seed into the good ground is he that heareth the Word and understandeth it." "That on the good ground are they which in an honest and good heart, having heard the Word, keep it and bring forth fruit with patience" The wayside hearers do not understand it; these do understand it. In the former it does not enter the soul, but lies, as it were, on the surface, so that it can easily be taken away. In the latter the mind takes hold of it; it passes through the understanding into the heart. As a living power it therefore manifests life and bears fruit, according to the gifts of the individual and the use made of these gifts: some thirty, some sixty, and some a hundred fold.

No attentive and devout reader will fail to see that these four classes of hearers are not represented as being visited by the Word for the first time. It is not in accordance with the general teaching of Scripture to conceive some as naturally hardened, like the first class, or as naturally good and honest, like the fourth class. They are by nature neither one nor the other. Nor do souls naturally belong to either of the two intermediate classes. The hearts of one portion of the human race is no more like the thin soil on the rock or like the ground overgrown with thorns than is another portion. By nature they are all alike. Sin does not render it impossible for some to be saved and grace does

not render it impossible for some to be lost. As far as it lies in the devil's power, all will be led to perdition; as far as it is possible in accordance with the economy of grace, God will have all men to be saved and will effect the salvation of all. The seed is the same in all cases, and the effect will, according to the will of God our Savior, be the same in all cases, unless something else intervene to hinder the accomplishment of God's purpose. That which does intervene is not the original nature of the different persons concerned. The depravity of man is total and universal. There is no difference among the individuals of our race in that regard. "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God;" "and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." The whole world lieth in wickedness; the whole race is under condemnation; all men are helpless, and without Christ can do nothing. Hence when the Word comes to individuals, it finds no honest and good hearts that will, by any power that is originally in them, understand and receive it. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him." 1 Cor. 2, 14. That which makes the difference is in all cases the personal activity of the individual. Satan would make all wayside hearers, if he could; God would make all faithful hearers, if grace could effect this. Grace could effect it, if there were only the sin of our common nature to overcome; it cannot effect this when the personal will is set against its saving operation and the result could be reached only by exerting divine omnipotence to force the individual into the kingdom of heaven. Such compulsory measures conflict with God's creative as well as with His redemptive plan. Some, when grace comes to them in the Word, stubbornly resist all its light and power; some, under the influence of that grace, yield quickly, but closing the inmost recesses of their souls against its penetrating and invigorating power, as quickly fall away when the trial comes; some, led by the Spirit who works through

the Gospel, believe and prosper, but suffer the flesh to live and work and gain the predominance and thus in time to crush the life out of them, so that they yield no fruit at last; and some, drawn by divine grace and using day by day the gift imparted, are made sincere Christians, who increase in strength as they continue zealously to use the Word, and bear fruit and keep on bearing it unto eternal life.

The honest and good heart is a result of hearing and understanding the Word. Why the same Word with the same grace does not produce the same effect upon all hearts, though all are equally embraced in God's mercy and Christ's merits and all are equally capable of salvation, involves a mystery which the human mind is unable to fathom. How it is that, after the Word has once been wilfully resisted, the soul becomes hard as the way-side, and how it is that, after the reception of the Word into the soul, one becomes like the earth-covered rock and another like the thorny ground, is sufficiently explained by the neglect to make proper use of the gift bestowed and of the power accompanying the gift. It is a general law of life, physical as well as spiritual, that disuse leads to decay and death. The grace that is not employed wanes and is finally withdrawn. Therefore the seed by the way-side is taken away, that which has no depth of earth dies in the sun, and that which falls among the thorns is killed by choking. But all the hearers thus represented are originally in the same condition. Why then are not all like the way-side, resisting the entrance of the Word with its light and life, or, if an entrance is once effected, are not all like the rock or the thorny ground, on which it bears no fruit? The natural condition of the human heart is such as to favor this result. The first effects of the Word are indeed inevitable, so that the natural repugnance, so far as it is not a conscious decision of the will against the revealed truth, is overcome by the grace which it conveys. But if the effect of that were the hindering of

any personal volition against Christ, it would be hindered in all cases, and all would in consequence have honest and good hearts and would bear fruit. This is not the fact. Some positively decide against the Savior and become like the way-side; some having received Him, neglect the gift of God that is in them and fall back into their original state of death; only a comparatively little flock continues steadfast and brings forth fruit. That grace produces this result is just as certain as that sin produces the opposite result. Grace gives life, sin works death. But sin works in all, and the Word bears grace to all. That some have an honest and good heart and receive the Word, is God's work of grace; that *only* some have an honest and good heart is not God's work. He conveys the same grace of regeneration and perseverance to all by His blessed Word, and His intent and desire is that all alike should receive it. And although death-working sin is in man's nature, and is in all men alike, it is no insuperable obstacle to the work of the life-giving Word. If it were, there would be no honest and good heart that could or would hear and understand and bear fruit. Sin does not compel the rejection of God's gift, else not a soul could receive it and be saved; grace does not compel the reception of God's gift, else not a soul would reject it and be lost. Why one man by the power of sin, in spite of the grace offered in the Word which rendered reception possible, rejects it, and another man, by the power of divine grace, in spite of the repugnant operation of sin, receives it, can be explained neither by the inherited depravity of man's nature, which is the same in all, nor by the gracious will of God, which is the same towards all, but is a mystery of the personal will of the individual, which, whatever may be the influences exerted upon it, has always that freedom from necessitation implied in personal responsibility.

Nor would it be of any practical benefit if we could solve that mystery. The grace of God that bringeth sal-

vation comes to us, and with it the power in an honest and good heart, having heard the Word, to keep it and bring forth fruit with patience. The Word that is preached to us is quick and powerful, and no one has any excuse if he is an unfruitful believer. Let that Word be faithfully preached among men, and the power of God unto salvation is brought to them. "Take heed therefore how ye hear; for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have." The responsibility rests entirely upon the hearer. The salvation of God has come when the Word has come: "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear!" M. Loy.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. X. APRIL, 1890. No. 2.

THE GROUND OF DIVORCE.

Recent statistics of divorce are painful reading. They plainly show that the public conscience in regard to the divine institution and law of marriage is elastic, if not seared. Divorces are obtained with ever increasing ease and frequency. Courts grant them on grounds that to thoughtful minds cannot but appear trivial, and in but too many cases under circumstances that render the injustice to innocent parties too palpable for concealment. It is therefore no wonder that the subject of divorce is engaging the attention not only of ministers of religion, but of statesmen who are concerned for the safety and welfare of the country.

An examination of the subject in the light of Holy Scripture cannot well avoid the preliminary question, whether the matrimonial bond may be dissolved at all otherwise than by death. Some have maintained that it cannot; some have even doubted whether death effects a separation, and have therefore questioned the lawfulness of a second marriage.

On a certain occasion the Pharisees came to Jesus, "tempting Him and saying unto Him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And He answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that He which made them at the beginning made them male and fe-

male, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Matth. 19, 3–6. So much is beyond all controversy clear from these words, that the marriage tie is divine and no authority has been conferred on man to break it. If it is capable of being broken at all, it is only by ignoring the divine ordinance and transgressing the divine law. Man sins if he puts asunder husband and wife, whom God hath joined together. Whether they are really put asunder in God's sight, and thus cease to be man and wife, when such sin is committed, is obviously a separate question.

On another occasion the Sadducees, who denied that there is any resurrection, came to our Lord with what seemed to them the perplexing question, which one's wife the woman would be who had seven husbands. Matth. 22, 23–30; Mark 12, 18–25. The passage is noteworthy in reference to our subject on two accounts. It shows that the thought of those who regard the union effected by marriage as extending beyond this life is not new. The Sadducees, though they denied the whole doctrine of the future life, assumed that what the Scriptures teach concerning marriage implies the continuance of the bond after death. That was the point on which they depended to embarrass the Savior. If there were a resurrection of the dead, they argued, then those who were married in this life would remain one flesh in the life to come. But that would involve an absurdity when one woman had seven husbands. Hence they inferred that there could be no resurrection of the dead. But the passage is instructive in another respect. It shows that the assumption of the Sadducees was false as well as their reasoning from it. "Jesus answered and said to them, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in

marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." Matth. 22, 29. 30. They err in regard to the teaching of Scripture concerning the marriage bond, as they err in regard to the power of God to raise the dead; for the sainted dead are in respect to marriage like the angels, among whom there is no use and no place for matrimony. The text plainly teaches that the marriage bond does not continue after death, and that therefore the relation in which a person stands to a deceased wife or husband does not by divine ordinance form an obstacle to a second marriage. Death dissolves the bond. "The woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her husband as long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband." Rom. 7, 2. Marriage is ordained for this life only, and has no purpose and no continuance beyond the grave. It may be needful to mention that this does not militate against the hope of recognition and continuance of happy unions of hearts in heaven between those who were dear to each other on earth. All that it shows is that the marriage bond is sundered by death.

The Romish church maintains that nothing else can sunder it, and therefore refuses to recognize divorce in any other sense than that of a separation of married parties from bed and board, while they continue to be husband and wife. The Council of Trent, sess. 24, can. 7, declares: "If any one says that the Church errs when it taught and teaches that according to the evangelical and apostolical doctrine the matrimonial bond cannot be dissolved by the adultery of one party, and that neither party, not even the innocent one that gave no cause for adultery, can enter into another marriage as long as the other party is living, and that he who dismisses an adulterous wife or she who dismisses an adulterous husband and marries another, commits adultery, let him be anathema." The scriptural idea of marriage as a union between two persons who in the exercise of their free choice have become one flesh, as distin-

guished from the promiscuous cohabitation of brutes with any individual of the species for the gratification of animal appetite, lends some plausibility to this view. And this seems to be confirmed by our Lord's words as recorded by Mark and Luke: "Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery, and he who marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committed adultery! Luke 16, 18. But these words were spoken, as the context shows, with reference to divorces that were in vogue among the Jews in contravention of the divine ordinance, and marriages contracted by parties thus sinfully divorced were in all cases adulterous. That there might, however, be no misunderstanding in the matter our Lord inserted an important qualification, as we learn from the report furnished by Matthew: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery." Matth. 19, 9.

The rule had previously been laid down in Christ's sermon on the mount. We there read "It hath been said, whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement; but I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery." Matt. 5, 31. 32. Romanists have had great difficulty to find a plausible way of bringing this into accord with their doctrine of marriage. That it recognizes a cause of divorce is manifest to every reader. Some have therefore referred the πορνεία (fornication) to a period prior to the marriage, so that it would be a hindrance to its consummation, not a ground for dissolving it. Some have pretended that our Lord merely shows what the Mosaic law admitted as a cause of divorce, not what He sanctions. Some have regarded it as an accommodation to current opinions for the purpose of paving the way for a true conception. Some have resorted to the desperate meas-

ures of pronouncing the words which state the grounds of divorce as interpolations wherever they occur. That the Scriptures are against them and need emendation to bring them into harmony with papal teaching is thus admitted. Those who reverence the Scriptures and stand in awe of the Word of God will have nothing to do with such violent efforts to suppress the doctrine of Christ and rid His kingdom of its authority. According to His teaching the matrimonial bond may be sundered not only by death, but also by fornication or adultery.

It is indeed not expressly said, in the passage before us, that fornication is a disruption of the marriage tie, or even that it necessarily leads to a separation between the persons joined in marriage. What it does say is that if a man puts away his wife for any other cause and she, supposing herself free from her husband, marries another, the parties thus joined live in adultery with each other. No other cause than that of fornication is recognized in the court of Heaven, and therefore the wife thus put away remains, in the sight of God, the wife of him who has dismissed her. Whosoever marries her therefore commits adultery with her. No decision or decree of human courts can alter this. Before God those divorced on other grounds than that of fornication remain husband and wife still, notwithstanding all opinions of individuals or decrees of governments, and any cohabitation with such divorced parties, is adultery, even though it be sanctioned by human laws and no opprobrium attach to it in the community. But the case is different when the ground is fornication. That is excepted. If a man puts away his wife on that ground, she is adulterous already, and does not first become so by marrying another. The clear implication is that he has just cause for putting her away, and is subject to no censure under divine law. Fornication is the one cause that justifies divorce. For this cause a man may put away his wife, and only for this cause: that is the plain teaching of our Lord.

Whether the marriage tie is dissolved in fact by the adultery of either party is a separate question. The texts which show fornication to be a just and sufficient cause for divorce do not decide this. Nor is it practically a futile question. If a husband, as husbands unhappily so often do in this world that lieth in wickedness, proves unfaithful to his wife and cohabits with a harlot, is the marriage tie, broken before God and does the innocent wife cease to be his lawful spouse? Is she henceforth an adulteress when in her ignorance and innocence she embraces him as her lawful husband? No one who thinks of the consequence of the conscience of husbands and wives will be in haste to decide this is the affimative. "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." Rom. 15. 4. Therefore it is antecedently to be presumed that there is no such provision in the ordinance of God respecting the matrimonial union as would be a source of constant disturbance to the peace and comfort of conscientious Christians. Those who claim that fornication of itself puts asunder what God has joined, must prove their allegation. The words of our Lord do not say it. They do very plainly imply that for fornication a man may put away his wife, but neither asserts that this sin annuls the matrimonial union or even necessitates its annulment. So far as appears, the innocent may be ignorant of the other party's guilt, or knowing it may condone it, and still live in lawful wedlock. All that is clear is that fornication furnishes just cause for divorce. Whether the injured party shall take the steps necessary to secure it depends on such party's own judgment and choice.

The words of Scripture on this subject are such, that while this one cause of divorce is beyond reasonable question, it seems to be the only cause. Divorce leads to adultery, unless it is based upon this one ground. Is there really any other that is recognized in the court of Heaven?

The instructions given by St. Paul, 1 Cor. 7, in reference to matrimony has led most of Protestant theologians, including Lutherans, virtually to accept another ground. Accordingly it is customary to mention two; namely, adultery and malicious desertion. The subject challenges further examination.

St. Paul first lays down the general rule of constancy. "Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband; and let not the husband put away his wife." 1 Cor. 7, 10. 11. According to the ordinance of God husband and wife are to live together. Only thus can the divinely appointed end of marriage be attained. But if the case occurs in which either party thinks this impossible, whether because of ill-treatment or failure to provide for the household, or for any other cause except that of adultery, which our Lord Himself presents as a legitimate ground of divorce, and departs on that account, the continuance of the marriage bond must be recognized. They remain husband and wife, notwithstanding the local separation, and neither party can therefore marry another without committing adultery. They are still married to each other, and the proper thing to be done is to be reconciled to each other and live together, that the purpose of marriage may be accomplished. Even if this reconciliation is not effected, they are husband and wife, and neither party is free to contract a marriage with another person.

But marriage is not an institution for Christians only, and many who enter into the estate of wedlock are not Christians and will not hear what the Spirit says to the churches. The further question was therefore submitted to the apostles, whether if one party were a believer in Christ and the other would not accept the faith, a dissolution of the marriage should not follow. To this the apostle replies:

"If my brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." 1 Cor. 7, 12–14. The unbelief of one of the parties is no ground for divorce, and does not even justify the separation of husband and wife from the common home, though they should continue to recognize the matrimonial bond. If the husband or wife is a believer, Christian instruction can be given and Christian influence can be exerted in the family. Christian rights are enjoyed, and the Christian conscience need not be burdened. There is therefore no just cause for separation in such cases, unadvisable as it is that Christians and infidels should intermarry and thus multiply matrimonial cares.

After these statements come the words which especially claim our attention in regard to the subject before us. The apostle continues: "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases; but God hath called us to peace. For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? Or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife." 1 Cor. 7, 15. 16. The Christian must not, even if the husband or wife be heathen, regard that as a cause for separation, and must be careful not to give the other party any needless offence or any occasion for making it a cause of separation. God has called us to peace, and as much as lieth in us we are to live peaceably with all, even with a pagan wife or husband. In the latter case this is all the more a duty, because there is still a possibility that the unbelieving party will be converted, and that God will use the believing party as His instrument for this purpose. But if the unbelieving husband or wife, who as an unbeliever cannot recognize the same call to peace and has not the same motives of

grace to labor and hope for the other's conversion, departs from the Christian spouse, the latter must suffer it. If the unbelieving depart, what can the other do but let him depart. A brother or sister οὐ δεδούλωται in such cases.

Many theologians have understood the meaning of the apostle to be, that the person who is thus deserted is no longer bound by the marriage vow whose obligations the other party so wantonly renounces. Among those who adopt this interpretation it is not unusual to meet the difficulty of harmonizing it with our Lord's words admitting but one cause of divorce, by alleging that the apostle's declaration does not assign a second cause, but only presents a case in which a Christian may innocently suffer it. If in spite of all efforts to have peace the unbelieving spouse departs, there is nothing to be done but to suffer the departure. Gerhard, for instance, thus answers an objection to the doctrine that malicious desertion justifies divorce: "This detracts nothing from the exclusive declaration of our Lord, which asserts adultery to be the only cause of divorce, because He does not treat of one and the same question nor of one and the same case with the apostle; but Christ shows the cause of effecting a divorce, the apostle shows the cause of suffering it and of obtaining freedom on account of unjust desertion; Christ speaks of the one making, the apostle of the one suffering the divorce; Christ speaks of Him who departs from his spouse, the apostle of him from whom his spouse departs; Christ speaks of voluntary, the apostle of involuntary separation." He therefore concludes that between our theologians who accept one only cause of divorce and those who accept two causes, there is no contradiction. *Loci, de conj.* § 607. But this explanation also has its difficulties.

If it is assumed that adultery actually annuls marriage, so that husband and wife are before God and therefore in fact no longer such when one of the parties has sexual inter-

course with another, our Lord's words certainly pronounce that to be the only cause that can sunder what God has joined. This assumption seems to us untenable, for reasons already stated. But those who regard it as sound and scriptural will hardly be ready to accept the consequence of their theory, that while this is the only cause that breaks the marriage tie, malicious desertion renders the innocent party a sufferer from that cause. In adultery the sinning spouse would break the marriage bond and render the other free. The sundering would be caused by the sin, and the sinner would effect the rupture. Of course the innocent party would helplessly suffer it. In desertion the sinning spouse fails to perform the duties which the matrimonial vow imposes, and the innocent spouse is the sufferer. Does such desertion imply adultery on the part of the deserter, or compel adultery on the part of the sufferer? That is certainly not apparent. And if this were the case, it would only render the one case that breaks the marriage bond active, and one would be the agent and the other the sufferer, as in the case of actual adultery. In any case the innocent party suffers and the guilty party is the cause of the breach that inflicts the suffering. There seems therefore no just ground for the distinction. The allegation that desertion is a ground of divorce therefore does not conflict with the Savior's statement that adultery is the only ground; for if it actually breaks the tie, it cannot be only adultery that breaks it; if it does not break it, the innocent party suffers indeed, but does not suffer the sundering of the matrimonial bond, as the innocent party, on the assumption that adultery actually puts asunder what God hath joined together and dissolves the marriage, suffers the rupture when the other party joins himself to a harlot.

If, on the other hand, it is assumed, as we think there is good ground for assuming, that the act of adultery does not in itself annul the marriage and set the parties free from their matrimonial vows, but only furnishes just

ground for such annulment by a legal decree divorcing the parties, the allegation that desertion is a ground of suffering while adultery is a ground of effecting a divorce seems without all foundation. For the question must in both cases be whether the sin committed is a sufficient ground for putting asunder what God hath joined together, so that the sundered parties may be free to enter into matrimonial engagements with other persons. The Lord decides that the ground of adultery is sufficient, and that this is really the only legitimate ground. The sinning party in such a case effects what is a recognized cause of severing the matrimonial bond, and the party sinned against suffers wrong and asserts his right to be separated. He is active thus in securing a divorce because he suffered wrong by the adultery of his spouse. But how about desertion? When the Lord declares adultery to be the exclusive ground on which a divorce can be claimed or granted, malicious desertion seems excluded as well as any other and every other alleged ground. But if it be said that this is indeed no ground for action on the part of the spouse who merely suffers the separation, but cannot according to the words of our Lord effect a divorce or cause it to be effected, adultery alone being recognized as the ground for that, the conclusion is obvious, that the separated parties are still husband and wife and the injured party cannot act in the premises, but can only suffer the separation from the injuring party, who still remains lawful spouse. If such injured party should act in the case and apply for a divorce, alleging desertion as the ground, in what sense and in what respect would such person be suffering, not effecting a divorce, any otherwise than one who applies for a divorce and alleges adultery as the ground. Therefore the distinction between effecting and suffering divorce, as applied to adultery and desertion, appears entirely groundless. Desertion is either a cause breaking the marriage bond or furnishing ground for annuling it, and

is thus of precisely the same force as adultery, or it is in the sight of God no ground of divorce at all.

Our Lord recognizes but one ground, that of adultery. His words are unmistakably clear on this point. Does St. Paul really say anything that ever seemingly conflicts with the Lord's plain and positive statement?

What he says is, that "if the unbelieving depart, let him depart; a brother or a sister is not under the bondage in such cases." What does he mean by οὐ δεδούλαται not under bondage? Does this mean that he is no longer under matrimonial bonds? If so, the desertion referred to must be put on a level with adultery as a cause that sunders or justifies the sundering of that which God has joined together in marriage. For such an interpretation there is no convincing proof. The evidence, on the contrary, is against it.

In the first place, our Lord says, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away, doth commit adultery." Matth. 19, 9. If a wife or a husband decide henceforth not to live with the other party and "depart," the one who suffers from such wilful proceedure has no more right to marry another than the one who inflicts the suffering, "except it be for fornication." If the husband run away from any other cause than that, "whoso marrieth her which is put away, doth commit adultery." They are still husband and wife, though the one party sins grievously by departing from the other, and the matrimonial union of either with another would be adultery, because they are still husband and wife. The apostle himself declares the difference in faith between the parties to be no ground of divorce, and if one on that account departs from the other, there is a sin committed and the other party suffers, but the sin is not fornication, which alone would justify divorce and marriage with another. Our Lord

admits only one ground, and there is no scriptural reason for construing the apostle's words in such a manner as to admit another.

In the second place, the passage before us does not warrant such a construction. The apostle teaches that the Christian husband should not put away a wife because of her unbelief, and a Christian wife should not leave her husband because he is not a believer in Christ. They are husband and wife notwithstanding such difference in faith, and they can live together without sin notwithstanding the difference. The believing party must therefore not leave the other party on that account. But if the unbelieving husband or wife, who does not recognize the obligation of Christian principles, considers that a cause of separation and departs, the believing convert has no choice but to let such husband or wife depart. But is the wife who departs then no longer the wife of the husband from whom she departs? What is there in the whole discussion of the apostle that would justify the assumption that she is not? Our Lord's teaching indicates that she is. The apostle's teaching is so far from being antagonistic to this, that it implies the same thing. For after declaring that "a brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases," he tells us that "God hath called us unto peace. For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?" No reason is apparent in the text for referring this only to what precedes the 15. verse, and denying its application to this verse also, which it follows. It certainly is applicable to the whole case. The Christian is called to peace, whether the unbelieving wife stays or goes, and the possibility of saving the wife remains, although the difficulty is increased, when she departs. The husband or wife has not ceased to be husband or wife, though one has without just cause departed from the other.

In the third place, the general rule which the apostle lays down for the guidance of those living in wedlock, obtains in this special case of difference in faith as well as in all other cases. "Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband; but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband; and let not the husband put away his wife." 1 Cor. 7, 10. 11. Then comes the special case of marriage between persons who do not both embrace the Christian faith, concerning which cases the Lord had given no particular instructions. Speaking by inspiration of the Holy Ghost the apostle now declares the Lord's will in this regard. They too are to dwell together in peace, the Christian hoping that the unbelieving spouse will yet be converted to Christ. That difference is not a ground that would justify divorce. But if the unbeliever departs notwithstanding, the Christian must endure what cannot be helped. But why should the rule then not hold good, "If she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband." That is what the Christian husband, who has been grossly wronged by the wife that departs, must expect of her and what he must insist upon as duty, and he must do nothing that conflicts with its performance. If she marries another, she commits adultery, because she is his lawful wife notwithstanding her departing. The fact that in the special case mentioned in verses 12–16 the one party is a Christian and the other a heathen does not change the relation and the right and duties in the premises. Indeed, those who maintain that desertion is a legitimate cause of divorce do not limit themselves to the case of desertion on account of difference in regard to the Christian faith. They speak of desertion on any ground, reasoning from the analogy of desertion for this special cause, and thus of "malicious desertion" in general. But for desertion in general the apostle's rule is, "If she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband." He is her husband still,

notwithstanding the desertion, and she can have no other, while he lives, without committing adultery. The apostle teaches nothing different from Christ's teaching, but simply makes the application of that teaching to the new question of the Corinthians concerning matrimonial relations between believing and unbelieving consorts.

Although we are not disposed to lay particular stress on the argument, we cannot refrain from urging also the great practical difficulty of accepting malicious desertion as a legitimate ground of divorce. Desertion takes place with such frequency and upon grounds so trivial that no one who has any regard for the law of the Lord or the welfare of society would be willing to consider these indiscriminately as actual breaches of the marriage bond or as causes justifying such breach. Those who hold desertion to be a cause of divorce are therefore accustomed to qualify it by the epithet "malicious." To say nothing of the noteworthy fact that the apostle does not make this qualification in the text under consideration, the question forces itself upon the mind, When is the desertion of such a nature as to render it malicious and constitute divorce, or a just cause of divorce? The mere departing of a consort from the presence of the other probably no one thinks in itself sufficient. A day's absence or a year's absence would not in itself constitute it, nor even a two year's absence, except so far as this might be accepted as satisfactory proof of the death of the deserting party. It is generally conceded that only when there is an evident intention not to return is the deserted party free from the matrimonial bond. But when is it evident that such an intention, even if it is expressed, is of such a character as to endure through life? A man in his rage may depart with the declaration that he shall never return to his wife, and in an hour or a day or a month or a year heartily regret his rashness and be ready for a reconciliation. May this not be the case also after two years or three years? A wife may de-

part from her husband with the intention of never seeing his face again, and may so declare persistently for years; but who can tell what change may before death be effected in her mind under the discipline of God's providence and grace? "If she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband." Death divides, and adultery is a sin of such a nature as to justify divorce, but desertion leaves the marriage tie unbroken and does not confer the right to break it. If it did, that right would exist after three days or three months as well as after three years. The arbitrary fixing of a time after the lapse of which desertion shall be a valid ground of divorce shows the practical difficulty of the doctrine. Only when there is evidence of the deserting party's death or ostensible marriage to another person and therefore of adultery, is the deserted party really free to marry another.

But what then is the import of the apostle's words? "If the unbelieving depart, let him depart; a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases." What else can this mean than that the matrimonial tie no longer binds him? It can mean that one is not bound to perform matrimonial duties when the wilful conduct of the other party renders this impossible. And that in view of the analogy of Scripture and of the context, it seems to us is all that it can mean. The unbelief of the husband is no good reason why the wife should leave him. That does not break the bond between them. She is bound, notwithstanding that, to live with him and do her duty as his wife. But if he leaves her and will not perform his marital duties, her conscience is clear; she has no responsibilities in the matter, and must not allow her peace to be disturbed by the thought that she is not living with him as she ought and doing what her marriage vow requires: a brother or a sister is not bound to do what the wanton conduct of a consort has rendered impossible. But the will must remain to do it, and if the

deserter repent and return, she must receive him and again do her duty, as the obstacle that rendered it impossible has been removed. The desertion of one party renders the other free from all conjugal duties while the separation lasts: the innocent party is not under bondage in such cases, but the guilty party is under bondage. He is bound by his marriage vow, and lives in sin as long as he refuses to fulfill his obligation. The marriage bond remains, notwithstanding the separation. Running away does not release from it: it only excuses the innocent from duty while the sinful conduct of the guilty party renders its performance impossible.

The result of our investigation therefore is that what God has joined together in marriage no man has a right to put asunder, that God does sunder it by death; and that for one cause, and only for one, He permits it to be put asunder; that this one cause is adultery; and that consequently a divorce on any other ground is not recognized in the court of Heaven and must not be recognized by those who are citizens in the kingdom of heaven. The whole may be summed up in our Lord's own words: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away, doth commit adultery." Matt 19, 9. M. Loy.

THE BIBLICAL CRITICISM OF OUR DAY.

The bible is the cynosure of all eyes in our times even more than ever before. But that for this reason the biblical study of the scholars of our generation should on the whole be an advance upon that of earlier times, is by no means a necessary conclusion. That in some respects this is the case, no intelligent reader can deny; that in many ways this is not the case is equally certain. Over against the bible study of the fathers that of our times claims to lay

chief stress upon what it is claimed our predecessors overlooked, namely the so-called "human element" in revelation. It is said that the bible students of an earlier day entertained a so mechanical conception of inspiration that their eyes were necessarily closed to the human commandings of the sacred books and hence could not give these the credit for their share in the production of these works. To do this is the idea and ideal of the popular bible work of our day.

It is then not an accidental feature of this bible study that the questions of history, chronology, archæology and the like, occupy a prominence never before enjoyed. The older generation of bible students did not exhibit the same zeal in deciphering Egyptian hieroglyphics and Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions, in viewing the book in the light of the land, in oriental history, customs and manners, as is exhibited by their successors now. The ideal aim now is to bring to bear upon the interpreter all the conditions that surrounded the original writer, and by thus as much as possible putting the former in the place of the latter, enable him to think over again and correctly the original thoughts. In this respect there is an advance over the manners and methods of former days. But it is also a step backwards, because modern biblical science has to a greater or less degree, at least in the case of many prominent investigators, neglected or ignored that divine character in revelation which it was the chief glory of other generations to have made especially prominent. But the loss under the old method was a hundredfold less than it is now when the divine element is even excluded entirely as the *sui generis* factor in these writings over against all other literatures. When scholars take the position of Kuenen, who declares it as his standpoint to start with that the Jewish and Christian Scriptures are no more a supernatural revelation than are the literary productions of Mohammed and Zarathustra, and that between the religion of the Old and the New Testa-

ments on the one hand and all other religions on the other there exists no specific difference (De Godsdienst, 1, 5–13 ons Standpunt), then the methods and the resultant schemes from such begging of the question can, of course, lay no claim to a fair and honest critical treatment of the Divine Word and Scriptures. Kuenen's reduction of religion and revelation to human factors exclusively is of course an extreme and radical, but in kind a representative illustration of the peculiar spirit and tendencies of the modern critical school.

In the application of these general principles and tendencies to the details of Biblical problems, the beginning must be made with lower or textual criticism. If the words of Revelation are to be interpreted in their own meaning and original signification, the first thing necessary is to have those words in exactly the same form and shape in which they were penned. In other words, textual criticism aims at the reproduction of the *ipsissima verba* of sacred writers. The necessity and justification of this discipline lies in the character of the traditional texts. We have none of the autographs of the Biblical books. In their reproduction by copyists, variants by the thousands have found their way into the text. *Habente sua fata libelli* is rather strangely true of the sacred books. In regard to the New Testament alone, Dr. Schaff (companion to the Greek Testament and English Version, p 176) thinks that the variants "now cannot fall much short of 150,000." Of these, however, only about 400 materially affect the sense, and only about fifty are really important; and not one affects an article of faith or precept of duty which is not sustained by other and undoubted passages.

The efforts of scholars to find the Ariadne thread out of this labyrinth of perplexities have been remarkably successful. As the result of decades of patient toil, collecting the facts and weighing them in the balance of correct principles, we have now a resultant Greek text that is

undoubtedly nearer to the originals of the New Testament than has been any text since the patristic age. The three texts of Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, differ in no important particulars. Practically we have now a *Textus Receptus*, not as the result of arbitrary choice, but which has been reconstructed according to the canons of objective literary criticism. No better summary and discussion of what has been done in this department can be found than the little manual of Professor B. B. Warfield "An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament." 1887.

In the Old Testament textual criticism an equally good report cannot be given. Indeed the whole problem, as far as method is concerned, is quite different from that of the New Testament. In the latter the manuscripts are the chief aid in restoring the original text; in the former the versions, notably the Septuagint, occupy this position in the critical apparatus. The oldest Hebrew Ms. in existence is the Codex Petropolitanus, written in 916 A. D. The Septuagint version was made in the second or third century before Christ, thus apparently representing a text more than a thousand years nearer to the originals of the Old Testament book. Whether in proportion it also represents an equally better text, is the vexed question for scholars in this field of research. The reconstruction of the Ezekiel text by Cornill proceeds from the premise that it does, and the new text thus secured differs materially from the traditional one. The recent work on the text of Jeremiah by the Canadian scholar, Workman, advocates similar radical measures, while Ryssel has found but little in the version of the Seventy upon which to base changes in the ordinary text of the prophet Micah. Wellhausen's examination of the text of Samuel—one of his earlier works—holds a fair medium between the extremes. On this problem, which primarily is of an historical and philological character, the investigators are not divided on the lines of radicalism and con-

servatism. Graf, for instance, who was one of the founders of the most rampant school for higher criticism, was also the chief defender of the superiority of the Hebrew text of Jeremiah over the Greek. Probably the most satisfactory and permanent work in this department has been done by Baer and Delitzsch in their critically exact edition of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, which series is now almost completed.

But even with the text restored to its original word and letter, the Bible student is not yet ready for detail interpretation and exegesis and for the construction of his system of Biblical truth. Modern critical methods, in accordance with their general aim and objects, have here put into practice the principles of higher criticism to a greater measure than was ever done before. No term in modern Bible study has been more misinterpreted by friend and foe than this. The idea that it implies superior and esoteric wisdom above and beyond that of ordinary mortals, is foreign to its legitimate aim and sphere, but has quite naturally been nourished by the fantastic and radical hypotheses of some modern scholars, which have been labeled with this name. In reality higher criticism signifies nothing but the collection of those facts and data bearing on the author, time, age, literary character, etc. of the text, which contribute and aid in evolving the meaning of the words. Generally there is included in it also the constructive process of formulating the scheme of Biblical history and doctrine which the critical study of the books has produced. Essentially it signifies the same preparatory work which a thorough study of a Greek or Latin author presupposes. The unfortunate name "higher" criticism was meant to indicate merely the next step after lower in the process of securing an exact interpretation of the text. The still more unfortunate abuse of the discipline by radical scholarship has completely discredited the term, for which another and better should be substituted. But even as it is, higher

criticism is made to suffer for some of the sins of the lower. The demand, e. g. for the elimination from the New Testament of the pericope in John 8, 1 sqq., of the doxology of the Lord's Prayer, of the last verses in Mark, of the Trinity passage in 1 John 5, 7 are not the outcome of higher but of lower criticism.

As has already been indicated the ultimate aim of the Biblical criticism of the day is a statement or restatement of the historical and religious development of the Scriptures according to what is considered the exact methods of objective criticism. To attain this end the first work to be done is an examination of the sources of information, in other words, of the sacred writings, as to what they teach in the premises. And here it is where both in methods and results modern Biblical criticism has made new departures and sought new paths. In both the Old and the New Testament the traditional views are not only antagonized, but in some cases considered as hopelessly undermined. In the Pentateuchal problem, for instance, the acceptance of an analysis into various documents has been steadily gaining ground. Since the death of Keil there is no prominent German exegete who accepts the Mosaic authorship for the whole Pentateuch, and since the death of Bachmann, of Rostock, all the Old Testament professors in the Fatherland accept the analysis as a fact. In Holland matters stand in this regard about as they do in Germany. America has the best and ablest living antagonist of the documentary theory in the person of Professor Green, of Princeton, who just at present is making an elaborate defence of this position in the pages of the *Hebraica*, published at New Haven, Conn.

The dangerous feature of this hypothesis does of course not consist in the mere fact that the Pentateuch in its present shape is regarded as a composition of several documents, but that these documents are arranged in such a way as to overthrow entirely the accepted views as to the religious development in Israel, by making the law proper not the be-

ginning and fountainhead, but the outcome and final result of this development. It is further made the text and the pretext for schemes of the Old Testament religion that are substantially naturalistic in character.

Naturally the Pentateuchal problem alone cannot suffice for this end. It is only one of the many reconstructions of Old Testament sources adopted for this purpose. There is scarcely a single book which is not dissected or shifted. In doing this the mere chronological redating cannot be looked upon as an objectionable feature. If this is a correction of an old blunder, the change is a matter of congratulation. But the radical methods adopted in many cases exclude the possibility of honest investigations and judgment. It is frankly acknowledged that the Biblical books in their present shape do not support the critical reconstructions. The hypothesis is accordingly advanced that many or most of these books have been revised from the standpoint of later Judaism, particularly from the standpoint of Deuteronomy, in order to give the older history and religion of Israel the stamp and image of a much later phase. In other words, it is assumed that the Old Testament books, have been intentionally changed so as to tell an incorrect story as to what the primitive Religion of Israel was, and the books are practically pious frauds, and in their present shape contain an odd and contradictory Kaleidoscope of primary and secondary sources, which it is the work of the critic to analyze and estimate at their proper worth.

In the application of such more than objectionable methods quite naturally extreme subjectivism must be the controlling power. As to what, according to the principles of historiography and criticism, is to be considered probable or improbable in the sacred records, only the choice and approbation of the critic himself can decide. Indeed the reason why there is so great a divergency in the opinions of Biblical scholars is not because one is in possession of more and better data than another, or is so much wiser than the

other, but because one is more ready to accept the statements of Scriptures on their own authority than the other. Practically it is in a new phase the old problem of faith and unfaith. The standpoint of the critic is in reality the decisive factor.

This criticism, both in its destructive and its constructive phases, is not confined to the Old Testament, although in recent years its application to this department has been the burning question before the English speaking world. The Tuebingen school as such is a thing of the past, but its place has been taken by others not unlike it in spirit. The old question as to the original character of Christianity and the difference between it and that of the early church is still the central problem for those who will not accept the plain statements of the New Testament, but consider it possible for them to go behind the evidences and test the correctness or incorrectness of these evidences by subjective standards. The view is quite generally entertained by more advanced critics, that the original teachings of Christ, who taught only a somewhat idealized Judaism, were materially modified by later and foreign influences. A favorite source of such change is generally found in the Greek philosophy of the day, which is regarded as having had not only a formal, but also a decidedly material influence in the development of the so-called Catholic Christianity of the close of the second century out of the primitive Christianity of the Savior Himself. The various phases of this complex problem and its proposed solutions are found in the recent works of Weizsæcker, Pfleiderer, Harnack, Holtzmann, Ritschl and others. Only recently one of the foundation stones of this superstructure, namely the formation of the New Testament Canon in the last decade of the second century, is being thoroughly undermined by the great work of Zahn, of Leipzig, the leading conservative scholar in this line of investigation. In a manner that is to all intents and purposes exhaustive, he has examined into the patristic evi-

dences on this mooted problem, and has found them to contradict entirely the accepted theory of the advanced school. How the latter will readjust itself to this new state of affairs remains to be seen.

From the above bird's eye view of the status, character and tendency of the popular Biblical criticism of the day, it is evident that the fundamental error of its methods and ideals is the tendency toward naturalism, the exclusion to a greater or less extent of the divine factor in Revelation; in other words, the tendency to make a human out of a divine word. This is the source and fountain head of fully nine-tenths of the errors of modern Bible study. Of course we have all reasons to feel thankful for what the scholarship of the day has done through its historical, archæological, geographical, linguistic and other studies to make the words of Scripture all the clearer and plainer; but it should be remembered that with all these outside elements not a single important doctrine has received a much clearer interpretation that the fathers gave it. While the historical and other external features of the Scriptures have doubtless been made clearer and more transparent, yet the general tendency has been to study, not the Scriptures, but rather *about* and *concerning* the Scriptures; and herein the old direct Bible study, in which the Scriptures were allowed to be their own interpreter, as this was practiced of old, especially by the fathers of the Lutheran Church, is not only not antiquated, but a prime necessity of the hour. The new ways and paths are certainly interesting and often instructive, but the Old in the whole was more profitable. The critical Bible work of to-day smacks too much of what Delitzsch calls "the religion of the era of Darwin."

From this point of view it is clear what a treasure we have in the old theological literature of our church, and how little we Lutherans need to be called upon to cease studying the fathers in order to watch the ups and downs of modern critical strife. Indeed the grand dogmatical or

Biblical litertature of our church is all the more valuable for our day and date, because it supplies the very thing which modern Bible study does not and cannot give.

G. H. SCHODDE.

THE RELIGION OF SECRET SOCIETIES.

I.

Lutherans antagonize the lodge chiefly on the ground that fellowship with secretists is syncretism and leads to an outright denial of the Christian faith. The evidences to substantiate the charges thus made against secret societies are furnished in abundance by the parties impeached; but it is both an expensive and laborious undertaking to gather them; and hence our thanks are due to every one who in any way adds to the array of evidences already collected. The subjoined extracts from the writings of prominent lodgemen were gathered by the late *Rev. Prof. G. Fritschel, D. D.*, of the Iowa Synod; and are published in an article of his as re-edited by his son in the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift.* Vol. 13, No. 6. Though some of them may be familiar to the readers of this MAGAZINE, it is thought well to reprint them in full in these pages for convenient use.

C. H. L. S.

A too common error that Oddfellowship is a mere beneficial society. *Charge of Past Grand at Initiation. Rev. O. F. p.* 64.

This order can never be made a merely beneficial institution. Journal Sov. Grand Lodge, 1880, p. 8213 (in Rev. O. F. p. 113).

It is unfortunate for our order and for not a few of its members that too much prominence has been generally given

to its feature of *pecuniary* benefits in seasons of sickness and death, and *pecuniary* aid in circumstances of want and distress. *Grosh.* Manual p. 110.

The applicant for Masonic light is required to declare even before he enters the lodge-room that in his application he is prompted not by mercenary motives. *Morris Dict.*, Art. Advantages.

Secretary: Do you seriously declare, upon your honor, that, unbiased by the improper solicitations of friends and uninfluenced by mercenary motives you . . . . offer yourself? Mackey's Ritualist p. 21.

This—the material advantage—though a laudable and useful trait in our operations is hardly a tithe of our aims and objects. Grosh. Od. Fel. Man. 1865, p. 80.

It is time that those who unite with us . . . . but for the loaves and fishes should learn that they have mistaken their aim. Ibid. p. 261.

The most ignoble is the motive of him who, by his connection with the lodge, expects to find external advantages and the furtherance of his own selfish ends. Allgem. Handbuch, I, p. 105.

In general it is to be insisted on here that the order of freemasonry is not a charitable institution, although it will never fail to be of benefit to everybody. Ibid. p. 409.

It—Masonry—rises above all human institutions and forms. Cunningham Man. p. 20.

It—oddfellowship—is as lofty as human thought and aspiration can inspire. Journal Sov. Grand Lodge, 1880, p. 8213.

The Temple of Honor—in oddfellowship—is second to no other institution on earth, not excepting the Church. *Temple of Honor ill.*, p. 8.

The acknowledged definition is (Mackey Rit. p. 548): Freemasonry is a moral institution established by virtuous men, a beautiful system of morality veiled in allegory. Sickel's Monitor, p. 7. etc.

Masonry is a universal system and teaches the relation and social duties of man. . . . He can hear moral precepts inculcated. Oliver. Dict. p. 471.

It has always been understood to have a distinct reference to the worship of God and the moral culture of men. Oliver. Theocr. Phil. p. 11.

As professing to "embrace in body and substance the whole duty of man as a moral being." Freemasonry by a M. M. p. 759.

The *Grange* is "assembled for intellectual and moral advancement," p. 24, and in their prayers they say: be with all orders and associations having for their object the advancement of education and the moral welfare and happiness of mankind. *Grange ill.* p. 68.

As morality is the great doctrine of an apprentice and science the great purpose, so religion of a broad and universal character is the prime inculcation of the master's degree. *Morris*, A pract. Synopsis, p. 271.

The aims of other secret societies are essentially economic, industrial, social and at the best charitable (?!) while those of masonry superadded moral and as many think spiritual. *Morris*, Light and Shadow, p. 265.

Masonry is therefore not the only moral, but the only *purely moral* institution; and the one which has the purest motives to morality, because it accepts of neither fear nor hope but of pure love to man only as the one pure motive of the highest morality. Allg. Handbuch I., p. 433. (Note the fling at the Church.—*Tr.*)

The object and design of our institution I could inform our opponents are no secrets. They are everywhere made known and may be found in every page of our history—the permanent union of good men for the promotion of their moral and eternal well-being. This is our object and ever has been. In its very foundation Masonry is a religious institution. Address of J. J. Sheppard before Lincoln lodge, C. L. 5831, Boston, p. 9.

This order can never be made a merely beneficial institution. Revised Oddfellowship, p. 113, 154.

Oddfellowship has a moral, a religion, a theology. Lodge Bul. July 1871.

(Masonry holds to) the same system of faith, the same practical duties taught by Revelation. Town. System., p. 200 ff.

The meeting of a masonic lodge is strictly a religious ceremony. Morris, A Pract. Synopsis, p. 248.

All ceremonies of our order are prefaced and terminated with prayer, because Masonry is a religious institution. Mackey's Lex., Prayer, p. 369.

(Masonry) Is pure, graceful and religious. Macoy, Eastern Star, p. 19.

Genuine freemasonry, my brother, is a system of morals, a pure religion. Macoy, p. 20.

Hutchinson defines freemasonry to be at once a religious and civil society. Macoy, Mystic Tie, p. 5.

The meeting of a masonic lodge is strictly a religious ceremony: The religious tenets of masonry are few and simple but fundamental. Morris, A pract. Synopsis, p. 284.

Masonry is purely a religious and charitable institution, claiming great antiquity. Sheppard, p. 13.

In its very foundations masonry is a religious institution. The same, p. 9.

It is a moral and religious inst. Thompson, Sermon p. 59; also pp. 8 and 9.

The principal aims proprosed by Solomon in the organization of Masonry were: 1. To teach true religion . . . The principal results of this organization have been 1. religious, 2. moral, 3. social, 4. scientific.

The personal qualifications of Solomon were a thorough knowledge of revealed religion (true masonry) as the mintl of God had divulged. Morris, Light and Shadow, p. 257.

It (Masonry) is a science which engages us in the search after divine truth. Freemasonry is then also a relig. inst.

The very science which it inculcates is in itself the science of religion. Mackey, Myst. Tie p. 3.

It is the object of Christianity to bind us to the performance of duty by the sacred obligations we owe to God, to point us to the hopes and expectations of another better world—then Masonry is so far a relig. institution. Masonic Advocate p. 48.

Freemasons adore the Grand Architect of the universe, therefore the order of freemasonry is religious in its teaching and practice. Macoy, Cycl. p. 278.

To be truly masonic in every sense of the word in which I can understand masonry is to be truly religious both in motive and in action. Mackey, Myst. Tie p. 6.

Dr. Oliver observed: If Masonry is not universal religion, it forms a most beautiful auxiliary to every system of faith. Masonic Advocate, p. 47.

Preston's definition, accepted by common consent as part of the modern ritual is, that it is an institution so far interwoven with religion as to lay us under the strongest obligations to pay that rational homage to the Deity which at once constitutes our duty and our happiness. Mackey, Myst. Tie p. 6.

The sober and discreet will rejoice in Masonry as a compendious system of moral and religious instruction, while the pious and devout will embrace it as an auxiliary to human happiness. Freemasonry by M. M. Town, p. 15.

Barruel in the preface to his *Esprit du dogme de la Franche Maconrie* (Brussels 1825) says: The purpose of this work is to show that the order of freemasonry is a purely religious society and that masonry is in accord with principles of faith, and the doctrines and mysteries of Jesus. The temple of honor is second to no other institution on earth, not excepting the church (which expression was officially endorsed by vote in the Grand Temple of Rhode Island). Temple of Honor, p. 8. (Others, not concurring, there is at present some disaffection on account of it. Finney, p. 174.)

The principles of freemasonry have the same co-eternal and unshaken foundation and contain and inculcate the same truths in substance and purpose the same ultimate end as the doctrines of Christianity . . . . Those great and fundamental principles which constitute the very essence of the Christian system.—The same precious promise (of the Messiah) is the great corner-stone in the edifice of speculative freemasonry.—Implies the arrangement and perfection of the holy and sublime principles by which the soul is fitted for a meet temple of God in a world of immortality. Town, p. 200–204.

There is not a duty enjoined nor a virtue required in the volume of inspiration but what is found and taught by speculative freemasonry. The whole duty of a man is clearly and persuasively exhibited to the mind. Town, in Stern, p. 19.

There is no duty man owes to God, his neighbor or himself under the Patriarchal or Christian dispensation, which is not fully illustrated and effectually enforced by our system of symbolic instruction. Masonic Advocate. p. 127.

Speculative freemasonry as a system evidently embraces in body and substance the whole duty of man as a moral being. Town, p. 23.

Masonry embraces the whole subject matter of Divine economy. Town, p. 24. Freemasonry by M. M. p. 184.

That freemasonry should be spoken of as a religious institution or as imparting religious instruction undoubtedly sounds strange to those who think religion must be necessarily confined to a particular sect or theological dogmas or, in other words, be sectarian. Macoy, Cycl., p. 325.

Masonry *is* not religion but *has* religion. The religion of masonry is not so much a confession of faith and a worship of God as rather a submission to God (Gottergebenheit), practical religiousness. Allgem. Handbuch, I, p. 410.

Freemasonry is not religion, it does not claim to possess any of the renovating efficacy of consoling influences,— —

Masonry then is not a religious sect. But although Masonry is not in itself either religion or a substitute for it, it is evidently a religious institution. (If it be the purpose of religion) to direct us in the conduct of the present by a standard which is to be applied in the future — — then in such a sense as this freemasonry is emphatically a religious institution. Mackey, Myst. Tie, under freem. and relig.

The word Mason is derived from the Greek and literally means a member of a religious sect or one who is professedly devoted to the worship of the Diety. Dalcho, p. 11, in Freem. by M. M. p. 233.

The sacred and invisible bond which unites men of discordant opinions into one band of brothers . . . is properly from the mystic influence it exerts denominated the mystic tie. Mackey, Lexicon, p. 320.

The religion of masonry is pure theism, on which the different members engraft their own peculiar opinions, but they are not permitted to introduce them into the lodge or to connect their truth or falsehood with the truth of masonry. Mackey, Lex. p. 402. Comp. Mackey, Mist. Tie, p. 33.

(Concerning doctrinal and other differences in the churches): Such things ought not to be and nothing but the want of sufficient charity has led to this state of things. As it respects the masonic inst. disunion is a stranger. (?)

(Among the ends of oddfellowship): "To subdue the asperities of sects and parties." Oddf. Textbook, p. 13.

These men of sectarian bias are the bad material, the soft, cross grained, crumbling, shaking, cracked, unmanageable candidates with whom we have the most trouble. Mystic Star, 1867; p. 136.

The system of Masonry as in its original conception still claims to be a system of religion in which all men can unite. Pierson, Tradition, p. 372.

Masons are generally charged to adhere to that religion in which all men agree. Ahiman Rezon, p. 35, in Freem. by M. M. p. 128.

A creed which receives the universal consent of all men, which admits of no doubt and defies schism. Mackey, Rit. p. 109. Also, Anc. Charges of Masonry, pub. 1723.

It is now thought more expedient only to oblige them to that religion in which all men agree, leaving their particular opinions to themselves.

He is charged to adhere to those grand essentials of religion in which all men agree, leaving each brother to his own private judgment as to the particular mode and forms. Moore, p. 5.

Lessing: The religion of the lodges, that, in which all men are agreed. Nielson, Freem., p. 61. Preston, p. 30.

. . . . So religion of a broad and universal character is the prime inculcation of the Master's degree. A pract. Synopsis, p. 271.

. . . . So broad is the religion of Masonry and so carefully are all the sectarian tenets excluded from the system that the Christian, the Jew, the Mohammedan, etc., in all their numberless sects and divisions may and do harmoniously combine in its moral and intellectual work with the Buddhist, the Parsee, the Confucian, and the worshiper of the Deity under any form. Ibid. p. 284.

The descendants of Abraham, the diverse followers of Jesus, the Pariahs of the stricter sects here gather around the same altar as one family, manifesting no differences of creed or worship. Grosh. Man., p. 277 in Rev. O. F., p. 158.

A universal brotherhood meeting and uniting in a plan far above the petty and changing creeds which enter into the religious and political opinions of the world. National Freemason, 1868.

The different religious forms and churches of men are but temporal appearances (inasmuch as everything depends on the spirit and inner form). Schauberg, Symb. II. p. 207.

Masonry is the religion of nature; and the Masonic temples are the schools in which the intellectual man is to be brought up in the religion of nature. Polak, Geschichte der Urrelig., p. 285.

The Druids: We derive our doctrines from mother nature. We study in the temple of the common Deity; this temple neither lies or deceives. Meier, Kirche und Loge, p. 10.

Christ appeared as the philosopher and teacher of a pure religion of nature. Nielsen, F. u. Chr. p. 88.

The secret object of this ceremony is . . . . to recall the brethren to natural religion and to pursuade them that the religion of Moses and of Christ had violated religious liberty and equality. Barruel—in Freemasonry by M. M. p. 293.

As masons we only pursue the universal religion or the religion of nature. Ahiman Rezon, p. 35, in Freemasonry by M. M.

The great book of nature is revealed to our eyes and the universal religion of her God is what we profess as freemasons. Dalcho, p. 13 in Freemasonry by M. M.

Freemasons call themselves Noachides or the sons of Noah . . . . claim to be his (Noah's) descendants because they still preserve that pure religion which distinguished this . . . . father of the human race from the rest of the world. Mackey, Lexicon p. 326.

(The 7 Noachide commandments make up) "the constitution of our ancient brethren." Ibid, p. 327.

The first Constitution of 1722: A freemason is hereby obligated as a true Noachide to keep the moral law. Nielsen, p. 13, 26.

As freemasons we belong to the oldest Catholic religion. Ahiman Rezon in Freemasonry by M. M. 220.

We shall attempt to show that ancient masonry comprised what may with much propriety be termed ancient Christianity. Town, p. 84.

The religion of nature, the religion of the pure reason, the higher and purer theism (Gottesglaube) of Christianity, according to which there is one God, one humanity, one Spirit. (Shauberg I. p. 374.) Such is the pure human standpoint, which is exalted far above every cultus and every dogma.

Making Masonry a sect—"such a supposition soon would reduce it to the level of a religious sect, and utterly destroy its universality." Oliver, Dict. p. 660.

The Masonic idea of religion is absolute, everlasting and unchanging.—Religion is everlasting and immutable. It is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever . . . . that religion in the light of which all masons, whatever their particular creeds, desire to walk — that religion can never change. Macoy, Cyclop. p. 325.

Should the time ever come in which the great problems of all religious creeds shall have been solved, and the then discovered true religion be found to rest on knowledge as well as on faith: then no doubt masonry will be merged with the Church into one institution. Allgem. Handbuch. I. p. 433.

Masonry also includes within itself a dogmatics (Glaubenslehre) such as is founded on moral experience and on scientific, especially physical, research; but it leans more in the direction of a philosophy of religion than of a positive doctrine of religion. Ibid, I. p. 410.

The most prominent facts which freemasonry inculcates directly or by implication in its lectures, are—that there is a God; that He created mankind in a state of innocence, in paradise, which they forfeited by obedience to the serpent; that a Redeemer was to come; that God sent the flood, and renewed His covenant; Exodus from Egypt; and that, when the fulness of time was come, God sent His Son. Oliver, Dict. p. 434. (Retranslated from the German.)

There are lodges which have made the acknowledgement of Holy Scripture a condition of membership; to wit:

Ohio: Resolved that this Grand Lodge is clearly of the opinion that a distinct avowal of a belief in the Divine Authority of the Holy Scripture should be required of every one who is admitted to the privilege of Masonry and that a denial of the same is an offense against the institution calling for exemplary discipline.

Texas, 1857: That the Grand Lodge of Texas declare that a belief in the Divine authenticity of the Holy Scriptures is an indispensable prerequisite for Masonic admission. Chase, Digest, p. 208.

Iowa, 1855: Resolved that Masonry as we have received it from our fathers teaches the Divine authenticity of the Holy Scriptures and that the views of the candidate on this subject should be ascertained. Ibid, p. 210.

No Christian doubts the authority of the Bible and in this country we need not trouble ourselves much about any other class of people.

We place it upon our altars as the Word of God. . . . If any offer who are not willing to recognize and take it we are not bound to receive them. C. W. Moore in Chase, Dig. p. 200.

But against this position there is an emphatic protest by others, e. g:—

The Grand Lodge of Ohio attempted to amend as they supposed the law, and at once the universality of the institution is destroyed and none but the Christian becomes eligible to initiation. Chase, Dig. p. 208.

Your Com. believe this all wrong. The Jews, the Chinese, the Turks, each reject either the New Testament or the Old, or both; and yet we see no good reason why they should not be made masons. In fact Blue Lodge Masonry has nothing whatever to do with the Bible. It is not founded

on the Bible; if it was, it would not be Masonry. Chase, Dig. p. 208.

The articles of faith generally held are: "Believe in the Supreme Being, in *some* revelation of His will, in the resurrection of the body and immortality of the soul. Macoy, Cyclop. p. 227.

A belief in the existence of God as the Grand Architect of the universe is one of the most important Landmarks of the order. — — Subsidiary to this belief in God as a Landmark of the order is the belief in a resurrection to a future life. This landmark is not so positively impressed on the candidate by exact words as the preceding; but the doctrine is taught by very plain implications and runs through the whole symbolism of the order. To believe in masonry and not to believe in a resurrection would be an absurd anomaly. Macoy, Cyclop. p. 220.

An unwavering faith in the Creator—hope in immortality—universal charity—necessity of virtue, temperance, fortitude, prudence and justice. (Mas. Articles of faith accord. to) Mas. Advocate, p. 23.

The creed of a Mason. . . . It is the belief in God the Supreme Architect of heaven and earth, the dispenser of all good gifts, and the judge of the quick and the dead. Mackey Lex. p. 100.

The belief in a God and in His superintending providence —Beyond this it does not venture, but leaves the minds of its disciples on other points perfectly untrammelled. The same, p. 402.

— — whose theology embraces the important dogmas of a supreme Creator and of a future existence — — to inspire its disciples with a reverence for the Diety and an implicit trust in His superintending providence both here and hereafter. Mackey, Mystic Tie, p. 3.

— — that belief in the Supreme Being I. G. A. O. T. U.

who will punish vice and reward virtue is an indispensable prerequisite to admission to masonry. Const. of L. of N. Y. Macoy, p. 225.

The belief and trust in one God and in a Divine revelation and obedience to the 10 commandments of Sinai are essentially opposed to which nothing "opposite" nor contradictory can be tolerated. Morris, Pract. Synop., p. 2.

Freemasonry holds in its embrace all the world and reaches through all time. Macoy, Cyc. p. 95.

The most opposite tenets and the most contradictory opinions must be harmonized on the broad basis of the Ancient Charges of Masonry, else freemasonry as such could not exist. Morris, Pract. Synop. p. 2.

The Jew, the Japanese, the Mohamedan, the Christian —all enter our lodges under the broad banner of brotherly love without any fear of theological controversy. Mas. Advocate, p. 46.

Followers of different teachers, ye are worshipers of one God who is Father of all, and therefore ye are brethren. Grosh. Man. p. 280.

We gradually undermine walls which men have interposed between themselves, we bring together the divided spirits. Allg. Handbuch I., p. 438.

In works of humanity all differences of creeds or worship should be forgotten, the tables of stone with the moral law written on them present a common basis of worship and pure morality for all mankind. They teach that God is our Father and we are brethren. O. F. Ritual, p. 221.

Jew, Gentile, Catholic, Protestant are welcome as such .... The descendants of Abraham, the followers of Jesus, the Pariahs of the stricter sects all assemble about the same altar among us. They have left their prejudices behind them at the door. Meier p. 10. (See Grosh. Man. p. 369, &c.)

THE CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE IN SCIENCE.

Christianity is a power in the soul which pervades the whole life. No one is really, though he may be nominally, a Christian without having been brought under the influence of that power. "I am crucified with Christ," says St. Paul; "nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." Gal. 2, 20. "They that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." Rom. 8, 8. 9. A Christian is one who is born again of the Holy Spirit, and thus by the supernatural work of grace possesses a life which is not his by nature. "You hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins, wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. But God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace are ye saved)." Eph. 2, 1–5. Christ lives in His people, and by faith they live.

All Christians are not indeed pervaded by this power of grace to the same extent and in the same degree. Some are babes and some have attained to mature manhood in Christ. It is not contended that all have the same gifts and all are therefore capable of the same work in the kingdom of God. That is manifestly not the case. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diver-

sities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." 1 Cor. 12, 4–7. Some have natural endowments which qualify them for places and labors beyond the abilities of others, and some have used the gifts of grace more faithfully and more effectually than others, so that they are in labors more abundant and in conflict more robust. But all, whether their gifts be small or great and whether they be weak or strong, have the Spirit of Christ and live by faith in Him. Without this they would not be Christians. As a living being without a rational soul is not a man, so a man without spiritual life is not a Christian; and as the bodily creatures endowed with rational souls are men, although they differ vastly in their human gifts and powers, so those who live by the faith of the Son of God are Christians, though they differ largely in their Christian callings and abilities.

When a man is a Christian, he is such in all his relations and operations. He cannot be a Christian only in spots and spurts. He may pretend to be a Christian in some things and lay aside the pretense in others, but his fundamental condition is not changed by his veering policy. He has no spiritual life in him, or it would show itself, though it might be in weakness, in one department of activity as well as in another. It is possible for a person to confess in public like a Christian and think in private like a heathen: dissimulation is always within the range of human possibility on earth: but it is not possible, while he so orders his life, that he should be a believer in Jesus. A man may "devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayer," but it is said of such, "Therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation." Matt. 23, 14. Such people are not disciples of Christ in the one respect and followers of Satan in the other: they are in every respect in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity. No doubt there

are many who on Sundays pass for good Christians in the congregation and who on week day's so conduct their business that they pass for veritable Shylocks; but they are no more the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus when they are saying their prayers than when they are fleecing their neighbors. A Christian may have many weaknesses of character and many sins to bewail; but with all his infirmity he walks not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. He believes in Christ as his Savior, and through the power of faith fears God and loves righteousness. That is the principle that governs his conscious life, and all sin, when he knows it, is an abomination in his sight. Only thus can he have the consolation which is the abiding support of believers, that "there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8, 1. The new life from the fulness of Christ must become dominant in the soul, or the Spirit will be grieved and take his departure, leaving it in its natural state of death and disability. "Little children, let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous. He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for His seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." 1 John 3, 7–9. Where there is no spiritual life, the person is not a Christian; where there is spiritual life it will be a power in the soul that consents to nothing in conflict with God's Word.

This new power introduced by the grace of our Lord affects the Christian's thinking as well as his feeling and willing. The life that was ruled by the flesh is now ruled by the Spirit. Selfishness has given place to love. Instead of ordering everything to suit his own natural desires and

inclinations, the Christian seeks to please his Lord. "The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that He died for all, that they which live should henceforth not live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them and rose again." 2 Cor. 5, 14. 15. The Lord is King, and the Christian recognizes this. Therefore all his concern is that the Lord may reign and that His will may be done. He does not set up his thoughts and opinions against the Word of God, who alone rules, and does not oppose his desires against the will of the Lord, which is wisdom and righteousness and blessedness. He has learned to pray, "Thy will be done," and, knowing that that will alone can secure the creature's happiness and bring harmony out of the discords of this life, to pray it right heartily. "Though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh; (for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds;) casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. 10, 4. 5. He who is truly a believer in the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, harbors no thoughts and entertains no theories that conflict with the supernatural revelation to which he owes all his knowledge of the glorious things spoken concerning Christ and the Church and all his hopes in regard to the future of the human race.

Why should he, or how could he, give place in his mind to any such oppositions of science, falsely so called? We plead for faith in God's Word, first of all and above all; for faith to start with in all investigations of nature and revelation, and faith to continue with in all the progress that is made and in all the results attained; for faith to pervade science, that it may be Christian science, as well as to pervade our works, that they may be Christian works: for "without

faith it is impossible to please God," and "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Heb. 11, 5; Rom. 14, 23. There is no Christian principle for science, as there is no Christian principle for anything else, but that of faith, which trusts in the Redeemer of the world for salvation and which trusts in the Holy Scriptures for all saving knowledge of God's will and government.

We are not ignorant of the fact that the acceptance of this principle is precisely what infidel scientists decry as narrow prejudice, and what timorous and weak-kneed professors of Christianity deplore as damaging to the cause of supernatural revelation as against natural knowledge. But we accept the principle with all the obloquy to which it may subject us. It is sound and scriptural, and will stand when theory after theory which scientists propound shall have been discarded and become the laughing-stock of the learned in the advancement of science. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away," says our Savior. Matt. 24, 35. We believe what He says: God help our unbelief! If such faith is prejudice, would that the earth were full of it, as the heavens are full of it. No doubt to the infidel, who will not and therefore cannot appreciate the evidence upon which such faith rests, it seems a very superstitious and very unscientific thing to believe the words of our Lord and hold fast to them first and last, whatever discoveries may be made in the wonderful world around us and the still more wonderful world within us. But it remains the highest wisdom still, and ultimately it is the highest reach of intelligence. "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." Rom. 12, 1. 2. To this all the world is ad-

justed by Him who made it and governs it all, and there need be no fear that any true knowledge gained of the universe will ultimately fail to harmonize with it. Have faith in God, and all in the end will come out right. It is suicidal to make science an exception to this.

He that is not for Christ is against Him; he that will not accept the Scriptures as the infallible Word of God, whose authority is decisive and final, rejects their claim. There is no middle ground here. "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow Him; but if Baal then, follow him." 1 Kings 18, 21. It is a piece of impudence to ask Christians first to become infidels in order that they may appreciate the arguments of scientists, and a piece of consummate folly to surrender the fortress of Christianity in order not to seem prejudiced to those who make the impudent demand. We are free to confess that we have in all our studies and investigations certain foregone conclusions, chief among which are these: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." 1 Tim. 1, 15;" "all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the Word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the Word which by the Gospel is preached unto you." 1 Pet. 1, 24 25. Therefore we desire that all Christians should give most earnest heed to the words spoken by the Holy Spirit. "Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3, 15–

17. That is the only right position from which to start out in the investigation of the facts presented in this universe and the laws governing them. If those who have permitted themselves to be misled by appearances and ruined by speculations upon them think it right and proper to regard us as narrow-minded bigots and superstitious obscurants on that account, there is nothing to hinder them in this world of sin. But it remains true all the same, that "the fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." Ps. 14, 1.

But it is argued that if scientific pursuits be entered upon with such settled principles, that must in many cases furnish foregone conclusions, the student will be hampered and hemmed in on all sides; he will have to close his eyes to the facts which lie before him in the light of the sun; his theories will necessarily be defective because his principle has eliminated much that must needs be taken into account to construct a system that is complete; he must of necessity fail to make a generalization satisfactory to men of scientific habit, because he ignores materials which the book of nature plainly presents to view. The argument is part of the impudent pretensions which have become habitual with infidel scientists. Their foregone conclusion is that the facts which lie before the student of nature are inconsistent with the declarations of the Bible, and their consequent assumption is that we must stultify ourselves by rejecting the testimony of our senses and of our reason or abandon our faith in the Bible as God's revelation to man. The very boldness with which such assumptions have been made and spoken of as unquestioned and unquestionable, has led some professing Christians to make concession after concession to unbelieving men, and these concessions have increased their confidence in their theories and strengthened them in their arrogance. But their whole assumption is false. It has not been proved, and is incapable of proof. To one who sets out with infidel premises, the facts can be made to square

with their theory. That is the utmost that they can claim. To one who sets out with Christian premises, the facts can be adjusted at least equally well to the system. That is the least that Christian scientists can claim. It is simply a question of principle. The history of Darwinism furnishes abundant illustration of the subject. Those who accept and those who reject it, both of which classes embrace men distinguished in the walks of science, agree as regards the facts that are really known and established. They do not agree in the inferences which are drawn from them and the assumptions to which they are led as regards unexplored territory and things lying beyond the possibilities of human exploration. Evolutionists have started speculations and published them with a great flourish of trumpets as science, which other evolutionists have themselves assisted in hissing off the stage. Those of the atheistic type find no difficulty in adjusting the facts to their system, however inexplicable the earth and all that is in and around it becomes without a God; and find it easy to imagine facts such as their theory requires, and insist upon them as necessary because their theory requires them. The "missing link" is always presumed to exist somewhere, and to disprove its existence to their satisfaction is not an easy matter. If they made millions upon millions of years as the earth's past duration to meet the demands of their theory, they are free to fancy that it has existed for that length of time, and history shows how liberally they have used their freedom and how little account they made of it if they differed by a few thousands of millions. It is not true that the facts discovered in the universe compel the mind to accept any such speculations. The devout scientists, who feared God and stood in awe of His Word knew what was really ascertained as true quite as well as the undevout scientists who mock at the Bible. And so it is still. It is all mere unscientific braggardism to assume that there can

be no true science without renouncing faith in God and His Word. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. 11, 3. Without faith we will never understand this, and never will attain the right point of view for understanding anything in this mystery of earth and man's life in it. To minds starting right in the study of nature "the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork; day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge." Ps. 19, 1. 2. It is scarcely necessary to say, that to the fool, who hath said in his heart that there is no God, the glory of God is not apparent in the heavens above or in the earth beneath. But just on that account he does not understand them with all his boasted science.

We are not discouraging scientific studies. On the contrary, we would claim a humble place among the advocates of such pursuits. What God has written in his works, though it is entirely insufficient for the understanding of Him and His purposes and for the understanding of ourselves and our destiny, He has written for our learning, and reverently should we read it, and endeavor to decipher it where it seems illegible. But that this may be reverently done we must approach it as Christians, not stupidly lay aside our holy faith and blessed hope in order to seem unprejudiced to men who regard all confidence in revealed truth as mere prejudice that unfits for science. And the truth which the Word of God gives us must not be ignored in the study of nature, as if the supernatural light could only shed darkness upon the works of Him who gave it. There are things pertaining to this world, its origin and constitution and purpose, which can be learned only from Scripture, but which science needs to make earnest account of in order to see clearly the facts with which it has to deal and secure completeness in its materials and accuracy in its

classifications. In the interest of true science as well as in the interest of Christianity we plead for the Christian principle of faith in Christ and the Bible in scientific as in all other pursuits. M. Loy.

MISSIONARY DEPARTMENT.

IN CHARGE OF REV. E. PFEIFFER, A. M. OF DELAWARE, O.

THE ONE THING NEEDFUL.

When we look out over the world-field of missions and then upon the actual, ready-to-hand, consecrated resources of missionary enterprise, our minds are almost bewildered by a rush of conflicting emotions. We seem to hover between hope and fear. We would fain believe, and yet we feel doubts creeping upon us. One moment we are almost carried away by the boundless enthusiasm and triumphant energy of conquest; the next moment we are cast down by the apparently certain prospect of defeat. In the midst of our own thoughts and questionings there arises in our consciousness the royal decree of the Great King: "This Gospel of the Kingdom *shall be* preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Matt. 24, 14. What an assertion of power! What calmness and confidence of success! There is in that outlook neither condition or conjecture. *We* may fail to preach the Gospel; yet it *will* be preached. *We* may fail to bear witness unto the nations; yet witnesses unto all nations *will* be raised up and *will* go forth. The scope of *our* Christian activity may be limited to ourselves and our own selfish concerns; the scope of Christ's activity will still cover the world. The universal Gospel of the grace of God demands and necessitates a universal mission. And the mouth of the true and faithful Witness hath spoken it: There *shall be* such a mission!

This inspires confidence. It infuses faith. It re-assures us when we doubt or waver. Our King is marching on to certain victory. The missionary host is invading the dark places of the earth and taking the strongholds of iniquity. The decree of divine love is being executed. We see it in part. But still we walk by faith. And the more we see, the more strong and certain becomes our faith. That which has been accomplished, and which all who run may read and know, is a promise and prophecy of that which is still to be done and will infallibly come to pass.

All that we need to be anxiously concerned about is that we be actually enlisted in this missionary host and actively engaged in this war of conquest. Each one of us needs to make sure of his place in this great enterprise. The Lord can get along without me; but can I get along without Him? His cause will live on, though I die. But dare I die, if I have refused to serve Him while I lived? His Gospel will be preached in all the world, though I refuse to preach it or even to contribute one mite toward its diffusion. But can I afford to forego the privilege of serving such a King and engaging in such a service? The kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign forever and ever. And this will certainly come to pass, though I wrap up in a napkin and bury the talent entrusted to me, withhold from my Lord His own, and neglect to make a single personal effort toward this glorious consummation. But can I be a member of Christ's Kingdom and be guilty of such neglect? Is not such conduct, in the face of present opportunities, open doors and divine calls to enter, a strong presumptive evidence that I myself am not within the Kingdom? In short, I have infinitely greater need of my Lord and of His service than He has of me.

My brethren, are we in the habit of looking upon pastoral and missionary labors in this light? Does this humi-

liating, and at the same time invigorating and stimulating truth constitute the undertone of our preaching and the soul of our practice? It seems to me that, in iterating and re-iterating, emphasizing and urging merely or even mainly the *duty* of preaching the Gospel and extending the kingdom, there is great danger of blunting the sensitiveness, neglecting the sympathies, and repressing the nobler aspirations of the Christian heart. Not that the urgent claims of duty are to be omitted in our presentation of the Lord's work and the preaching of His Word. If need be, they are to be emphasized and beaten in even by the rod of the divine law. But ordinarily and for the vast majority of our people, I am persuaded, there is "a more excellent way." The sense of duty is not the strongest motive for the performance of works of love. The sense of Christian privilege is a vastly stronger incentive. Its development will form a purer, more unselfish, more Christ-like character. The sense of Christian privilege stands to the mere sense of duty very much in the relation of the Gospel to the Law. As the Gospel grows and asserts its power within us, the injunctions of the Law become superfluous, because superseded by a higher and more potent force.

The history of missions is an important factor and may render efficient service in the exercise and enlargement of this higher sense of Christian privilege. For this reason, we hold, its diligent study is as indispensable to the pastor as its sprightly and hearty presentation is advantageous and invigorating to the congregation. We do not forget for one moment that the work of implanting and fostering and preserving within the heart love and gratitude and devotion to God for His infinite mercy is solely the operation of the Holy Spirit through the means of grace. But this in no wise forbids the use or excludes the utility and contagious influence of those characters and works which are themselves examples and illustrations of the operation of the

Spirit of God. In no department of human history is the mighty hand of God more manifest, in none have more shining illustrations of His redeeming and sanctifying grace come to light, than in the sphere of missions. To neglect the study and exploration of this field, in which the Lord God has wrought so mightily and majestically, is to despise a most fertile source of practical inspiration for the Lord's work, and to lose the benefit of those manifestations of divine grace and power, acquaintance and contact with which could hardly fail to be refreshing and stimulating and invigorating to our spiritual life.

LITERATURE.

Two *standard* Reviews:

ALLGEMEINE MISSIONS-ZEITSCHRIFT. Monatshefte fuer geschictliche und theoretische Missionskunde. Herausgegeben von Dr. Gustav Warneck. Siebzehnter Band. 1890. Guetersloh. Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann. $2.30.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD. Editors: Revs. J. M. Sherwood, D. D., and A. T. Pierson, D. D. Funk and Wagnalls, Publishers, 18 and 20 Astor Place, New York. Subscription, $2.00 per year.

In our day a pastor's study must be regarded as very defective that is not graced and enriched by one or more standard missionary magazines. We presume that no pastor will question the desirability of having and using such a magazine. Many plead that their meager salaries will not allow them to take any papers or magazines in addition to those published by our own synod. The plea may be fictitious and the inability imaginary in some cases. If so, we pity the pastor. But we have no doubt that there are instances in which the claim is based on cold facts and penurious congregations. In this case we pity the latter. We

once heard of a church-member who figured up, in dollars and cents, his pastor's annual cost of living, and was economical enough to make all possible or probable expenses aggregate a little over one hundred ($100) dollars. And then he exclaimed in surprise: "What does he do with all the rest? What becomes of all the money?" The pastor was receiving a salary of $300. It would be interesting to know how much the man allowed for periodicals and books. In all probability this item never entered his mind. And this is a point, by the way, on which most of our congregations need to be enlightened and instructed. It ought to be shown them more often and plainly than is usually done that it is a piece of supreme folly, not to speak of the niggardliness and injustice of the thing, to give their pastor merely a starving support, barely sufficient to clothe and feed himself and family. It is a great pity that many poor pastors are too timid to tell their people the plain truth on this important subject. This is a point to which, in our opinion, no visitator should fail to give due attention.

Sympathy for those brethren in the ministry who are poorly fed, and whose supply of literature is even more lamentable, has led us thus to ramble from our theme. We would gladly, if we could, invent and carry out a plan by which every one of our pastors should be supplied with one or both of the Reviews above mentioned. In our own experience we have found them so helpful in every branch of our pastoral labors, so cheering in the midst of discouragements, so stimulating to flagging energies, so renewing and strengthening to faith and the inner man, that we cannot but feel sincere regret that any pastor should, willingly, or from necessity, be deprived of the advantage.

Both Reviews are unquestionably *standard* specimens of their kind. The one is typically *German*, the other is characteristically *American* in aim, tendency and make-up. The former aims to give the reader *multum;* the latter, *multa.* The German editor sifts his extensive material and compresses it into comparatively small compass; the American editors offer a much greater variety, and cover a larger

space, without, however, burdening their pages with empty verbiage or uninteresting details.

The *Review* aims to be "a Monthly Magazine (80 pages) of missionary intelligence and the discussion of missionary problems, covering every mission of every Society of every country of all parts of the world." The Prospectus for 1890 declares: "*The Missionary Review of the World* stands confessedly at the head of missionary periodicals. At home and abroad, among pastors, missionaries, and secretaries of Missionary Societies, it has met with a welcome as cordial as it is inspiring. The editors feel assured that the future will eclipse the past. The experience gained, the maturing of our plans, the adding to our corps of contributors many of the ablest writers on missionary themes in all parts of the world, our arrangements to get the latest reports from all the leading Missionary Societies at work in the field, and fuller official statistics, and accurate and prompt information from every available source, warrant the editors in promising a great advance on the past. We are now in touch with the entire machinery and organized work of missions throughout the world, and all that can be done will be done to make *The Missionary Review of the World* worthy of its name, and worthy of the noble cause to which it is consecrated. If the friends of missions will co-operate with us in seeking to extend its circulation, and in helping us in the way of information of what is doing in their respective fields, this *Review* will become a still greater power in stimulating missionary zeal and developing the resources of the Church."

We trust that these sketches are sufficient to enlist the interest and consideration of our brethren, and to induce many of those who are not taking a missionary magazine to subscribe for either or both of the above mentioned excellent *Reviews*, either immediately, or in time to begin next year. We would only add that Rev. A. W. Werder, Wheeling, W. Va., is prepared to receive subscriptions and supply orders for the *Zeitschrift*, and, provided 20 subscribers are obtained, he will be able to do so at the rate of $2.00 per

annum. Moreover, as a labor of love to the brethren, the writer of this department agrees to furnish the *Review* to any address for $1.60, *provided* a club of not less than 10 is secured, and the money is sent before the close of the present year. If any one desires to subscribe immediately, we can supply the *Review* for the present year at the same reduced price. For the *Review* at club rates address: Rev. E. Pfeiffer, Delaware, O.

OUR COUNTRY: *Its Possible Future and its Present Crisis*, by Rev. Josiah Strong, D. D., General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States, New York. With an Introduction by Prof. Austin Phelps, D. D. Published by The Baker and Taylor Co., 740 and 742 Broadway, N. Y., for The American Home Missionary Society.

Before a General undertakes a battle he takes in the situation. The Christian Church has a battle to fight with potent foes. The battle field is the United States. If the Christian Church would in any sense hold her own, not to speak of making advances, she must take into consideration the state of things in our land. We never had a book so well adapted to this end as "Our Country" by Dr. Strong. The book is not large, only 229 pages, and can be purchased in paper cover for 25 cents, or bound in muslin 50 cents.

Dr. Phelps in his introduction to the book truthfully says: "This is a powerful book. It needs no introduction from other sources than its own. Its great strength lies in its facts. These are collated with rare skill, and verified by the testimony of men and of documents whose witness is authority. The book will speak for itself to every man who cares enough for the welfare of our country to read it, and who has intelligence enough to take in its portentous story."

The book is intensely interesting. The reader is carried along as if he were reading a continued story. When one chapter is ended he is anxious to know what comes next. The greatest objection we found to the book was that we got to the end too soon. We wanted more. This desire for

more information will serve as an impetus to study faithfully the "possible future" and the "present crisis" of our country.

The subjects of the fourteen chapters will serve to give an idea of the book.

"*The time factor in the problem*" proposes "to show that the progress of Christ's kingdom in the world for centuries to come depends on the next few years in the United States." In the second chapter the author shows that our National resources are sufficient to feed and to enrich 1,000,000,000 people, more than one-half the present population of the world. The subject of the third chapter is "Western Supremacy." In this chapter it is affirmed that the country lying west of the Mississippi river will one day dominate the east. In other words, the West will, before many decades shall have passed, rule our country, because there will be more people and more wealth west of the Mississippi than in all the states east of it. In chapters four to ten inclusive attention is called to perils which threaten us as a people. These perils stare at us more terribly in the West than elsewhere. There are perils from emigration, perils from Romanism, perils from Mormonism, perils from intemperance, perils from Socialism, perils from wealth and perils in and from the city. What will become of us? is a question that one involuntarily asks whilst reading these pages on the perils of our country. In the eleventh chapter the author speaks of "the influence of early settlers" and again calls attention to the West, with special reference to the kind of people who are leaving their impressions on the rising communities. The twelfth chapter makes the claim that by the close of this century the public lands in the West will be almost exhausted, and by that time the future of this nation will be determined. Chapter thirteen affirms that the world's future is to be shaped by the Anglo Saxon, and that the United States will be the seat of power. In speaking of the responsibility of this generation the author in glowing terms drives home the logic he has used in previous chapters. We will quote a few sentences. "May

God open the eyes of this generation! When Napoleon drew up his troops before the Mamelukes, under the shadow of the Pyramids, pointing to the latter, he said to his soldiers: 'Remember that from yonder heights forty centuries look down on you.' Men of this generation, from the pyramid top of opportunity on which God has set us, *we look down on forty centuries!* We stretch our hand into the future with power to mold the destinies of unborn millions.

> 'We are living, we are dwelling
> In a grand and awful time,
> In an age on ages telling—
> To be living is sublime!'"

The fourteenth and last chapter must be read to be appreciated. Every sentence seems to have been weighed before putting it down. The subject is "Money and the Kingdom." On the subject of Christian giving we have never heard or read anything that will compare with Dr. Strong's appeal in this chapter. Cheap as the book is, in order to reach as many as possible, this chapter should be printed in tract form and scattered broadcast over our land. Every Christian in the land ought to read this chapter on "Money and the Kingdom."

In conclusion we would say that every missionary in our home field, every member of our missionary boards, and, in fact, every minister of the Gospel, and every officer of our congregations, should supply himself with a copy of "Our Country." Send for it to J. L. Trauger, 210 South High Street, Columbus, O. D. Simon.

Report of the Missionary Conference, London, 1888. Edited by the Rev. James Johnston, F. S. S., Secretary of the Conference. Two large octavo volumes, containing about 1,200 pages. Fleming H. Revell, 12 Bible House, Astor Place, New York; or, 148 and 150 Madison St., Chicago. Both volumes, prepaid to any address, $2.00.

The great London Conference was, without doubt, a stupendous undertaking. And, within the scope of its aims and plans, it seems to have been on the whole quite successful and highly satisfactory. Its merits and failings were widely discussed for months after the notable event had occurred. The ideal aimed at is unquestionably a grand one. Every branch of Protestantism represented; missionaries and missionary leaders and workers gathered together from all parts of the world; over 1,500 delegates deliberating, midst earnest prayer, for 10 days on the great problems of missions; papers read and addresses delivered by representative men, many of them specialists, from the remotest parts of the field—could any thing appear to be more desirable in its conception or more promising in far-reaching results? Whilst our convictions of truth and fraternization are such as to render it impossible for us to take part in any such unionistic movement, grand and blessed as it would be in an ideal state of Christianity, we cannot but regret that it is so, that the unhappy and God-dishonoring divisions in Christendom put such limitations upon us and compel us to carry on the Lord's work alone, as best we may. Meanwhile it would be sheer folly and arrogance on our part to cast aside the proceedings of the Conference as unworthy of our consideration and study. Not only may the zeal and interest and devotion manifested put our indifference and coldness to shame and spur us on to greater sacrifice, but the varied and extended information and intelligence and exchange of ideas and experiences that the Conference was the means of calling forth constitute a treasure-house of missionary literature which both the learned and the ignorant will find it advantageous to peruse.

In the two volumes before us we have a tolerably full report of all the proceedings, addresses, etc., of the Conference. And it was in perfect harmony with the purposes of the Conference to publish this extensive report at a price so extremely low.

Dr. A. T. Pierson, in noticing the "Report" in the *Missionary Review*, said among other things: "I have bought

25 copies myself to give away, and if I had the money I would put a copy in the hands of every minister and theological student in the country." Dr. Warneck, whom none will suspect of being inordinately enthusiastic or easily carried away by shallow pretensions and rhetorical flights of eloquence, expressed the following judgment with regard to the Report: "We are safe in calling it the most comprehensive Encyclopedia of Missions in existence . . . . These two volumes constitute a source of information which no one can in future forego who wishes to pursue independent missionary studies. As a matter of course, not all parts are of equal value in such a voluminous work, which contains the productions of so many essayists, and the addresses and remarks of an even greater number of speakers. Much might, without injury to the cause, have been omitted; some deliverances are entirely too rhetorical, others of too general a character; some parts are decidedly lacking in Evangelical sobriety and spiritual health; even historical and statistical errors are not wanting. But on the whole the Report comprises such an abundance of missionary wisdom and experience as cannot be estimated too highly and will prove of permanent value for all time."

The first volume contains (Part I.) the report of six *Meetings for Open Conference;* (Part II.) *The Mission Fields of the World;* (Part III.) *Special Missionary Subjects;* besides a valedictory meeting and an additional meeting for the passing of resolutions, and—a most valuable and welcome addition—an extensive Missionary Bibliography of fifty pages, a systematized catalogue of the entire missionary literature of the world. Part I. treats of the following subjects: The Increase and Influence of Islam; Buddhism and the other Heathen Systems; The Missions of the Roman Catholic Church to Heathen Lands; The Relation between Home and Foreign Missions, or, The Reaction of Foreign Missions on the Life and Unity of the Church; Commerce and Christian Missions; The State of the World a Hundred Years ago and Now as regards the Prospects of Foreign Missions. Part III discusses: Missions to the

Jews; Medical Missions; Women's Mission to Women; The Church's Duty and a New Departure in Missionary Enterprise.

The second volume reports the proceedings of 22 special sessions of the Conference, at which missionary methods and questions of theory and practice—"questions of vital interest in the prosecution of mission work were discussed by experts from all the Protestant Churches and missions of the world,"

"WAS WILL DIE INNERE MISSION?" von Harold Stein, Pastor in Kopenhagen. Deutsche autorisirte Ausgabe von O. Gleiss.,P.—Hamburg, 1884. Agentur des Rauben Houses. A brochure of 182 pages, at the low price of 35 or 40 cents.

Here are eight exceedingly interesting and instructive addresses on a subject in regard to which we pastors ought by all means to be informed. The Continental idea of "innere Mission" is nearly as foreign to us Americans as the continent of Europe itself. Not that the works of love embraced under the term are entirely unknown among us. But such as are performed in our land are not included in our common conception of home mission work. Then the works of mercy established and supported by the Churches in America are much fewer in number and variety, and are generally carried on much less systematically and energetically than is the case in Europe. And of some of the charities embraced by the "innere Mission" we in our country have hardly heard.

"Innere Mission" includes within its scope work (bodily and spiritual) in behalf of persons of all ages, classes or conditions who may be in want or woe—helpless and neglected children, young people exposed to countless dangers, the destitute, the sick, the fallen, the criminal classes. The attention of our Church in America has been and is still so completely engrossed by the work of home missions in the American sense as to render it practically impossible to devote much energy or thought to the building up of such

blessed charities as are maintained in the older and more densely populated countries of Europe. For years to come our main energies will have to be directed to the work of supporting and enlarging our present home missionary enterprises—of planting missions in our cities and gathering into congregations our scattered brethren in the great West. Meanwhile, however, the "charities" need not and should not be forgotten. The destitution and temptations, the sins and crimes of our cities cry as loudly as do those of European cities to the Church for help and alleviation and guidance and protection. We need many more charitable institutions besides orphans' homes and hospitals. Just at present there is an urgent demand among us for a Home for the Aged. We have heretofore been satisfied with the occasional mention of the desirability of such a house of mercy. Isn't it time to go a step further? Should not the prosperity and blessed work of our Orphans' Home encourage us to think more earnestly and speak more urgently about the necessity of providing better accommodations for the aged people of our congregations, many of whom are pining and languishing for want of proper care and attention? Then there is the work of deaconesses that may soon engage our attention, as the "Diakonissen-Mutterhaus" in Philadelphia is beginning to enlist the interest of the General Council. At all events it is not too early for us pastors to embrace every opportunity of gaining information and inspiration for the Lord's work in all its departments and ramifications. To these belong the many noble institutions carried on under the auspices of the "Innere Mission" in Germany, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and England.

The little book before us is a welcome contribution to the literature that represents this important cause. It has passed through several editions and been extensively circulated in Denmark. Even in Germany, where there is no scarcity of literature in this department, the translation has received a hearty welcome. The addresses are the fruit not of theoretical study and philosophy, but of wide per-

sonal observation and varied practical experience on the part of the author, who enjoyed the advantage of extended travels and acquaintance with numerous institutions of mercy. They are sustained and imbued by faith in the all-sufficient power of divine grace and the working of the Spirit of God through His Word and sacraments—a living faith in the Savior of the lost—a faith that glows and burns and worketh by love. We are in hearty accord with the sentiments of the author, expressed in his preface: "May all those who would be friends 'der inneren Mission' realize the fact more and more that it is not enough that faith be *enkindled* in the heart, but that the life of faith must also be *strengthened* and *confirmed*, to the end that it may actually bring forth fruit with patience, and become rich and richer in love which is the fulfilling of the law." The author hopes, through these addresses, to contribute something toward the fuller realization of this important truth, especially among pastors and teachers.

The introductory address briefly reviews the life of faith and love in the primitive Church and exposes, in contrast, the coldness and indifference of our age.

The duties of pastors and people are presented in the last address with a candor, force and fervency of appeal that are irresistible. The brethren may judge whether the author's portrayal of the state of things in Denmark is not equally true of our own. After referring to several "charities" and extensive enterprises carried on by individual pastors in England he goes on to state: "Among us this work of love on the part of pastors presents a sad appearance. For whilst truth and justice require us to confess that God's Word is preached with warmth and power in our land, and whilst every individual pastor may labor faithfully and zealously in his congregation, yet we in Denmark do not understand at all how to arouse an interest and enthusiasm in our congregations on behalf of the great work of love in the vineyard of the Lord. What is the cause of this lack? It is due in part, as I believe, to ignorance, because most of the preachers in the country (and in the

city?) have no acquaintance with the missionary enterprises of our day, and in part also to a certain pre-conceived, false and destructive notion that what is done by others is not suitable for our people, seeing that all the reports of "charities" carried on in other lands are dismissed again and again with the remark: 'Yes, that may work in England and Germany, but not among us.' Such ignorance and under-estimation or rather perhaps over-estimation of our nationality we must regard as a dangerous enemy." He then proceeds to plead that students in theological seminaries should not only be taught how to preach and catechise, but that they might also be made acquainted with the works of love and mercy, and at the same time learn how to engage in them. He answers in the most forcible and convincing manner, with the aid too of illustrations from life, the common excuse of so many: "We would like to engage in such and such works of love, — but we have no time!" After putting this unworthy lament to shame in the light of several examples of whole-souled workers, he proceeds on this wise:

"How does it come about that between such people and us there is so great a difference? Why have they time and money for all this labor, and we have none? The secret of the difference is this, that they are living, energetic Christians, while we are cold and sleepy disciples of the Lord; to them Jesus is the first and the last, and their whole life, both on Sunday and during the week, is full of love's labors and therefore also full of God's grace, whilst to many of us Jesus is only a name, a profession of the mouth, but not a power in the soul."

To facilitate the dissemination of this excellent production I would add that Rev. Werder has on hand a number of copies which he imported and can supply at 35 cents.

EDITORIAL BREVITIES.

OUR MAGAZINE was designed for the discussion of theological subjects. It was therefore expected that its readers would be gathered mostly from the ranks of Gospel ministers. But from the start it was hoped that the more intelligent laity of the Church, and especially of our own synod, would become interested in it and be found among its devoted readers. In this we have not been wholly disappointed. From the first issue we have had the support of earnest and active lay members, and the MAGAZINE has been conducted with a view to meeting their wants as well as those of the ministry. Most of the articles published could be read with profit by them as well as by their pastors. But the number of readers is not large: could not you who read this help a little to make it larger and thus extend the influence of the publication? Recommending it, as opportunity offers, to educated members of congregations might accomplish such a desirable end.

PASTORS must continue their studies, if they would make full proof of their ministry. The degree of knowledge attained when they enter upon the pastoral work may suffice to begin with, but it cannot suffice for after years. He who makes no progress as time passes is not faithful. The Lord makes demands upon us according to the opportunities which He gives us as well as according to the talents which He bestows. A minister who can not do his work better after ten years than he could at the beginning, is a workman that has reason to be ashamed. His profiting does not appear; his negligence and idleness does. The Master may call him to a field whose pastoral work makes such large demands upon him as to leave comparatively

little time for study, but even then, if the time is faithfully applied, marked progress may be made year after year. Generally there is ample time, if there is only the will to make good use of it. "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all." 1 Tim. 4, 13–15. That is the Lord's requirement, and it is a mere pretext that He gives no time to comply with it.

WHY are there so few ready writers among our ministers? They are mostly men of good education who have something to say and know how to say it. But our periodicals are often in want of the proper matter to accomplish their purpose well. How many of our pastors, for instance, have been contributors to our MAGAZINE in these ten years of its existence? This matter undoubtedly stands in close connection with that to which reference has just been made. Those who do not diligently continue their studies after they enter the ministry will not exert an influence through the press. It is to be feared that some use the pen so little that they would hardly know how to put together an article, even if they desired to furnish it. That is not commendable. Writing must be kept in practice even though one thinks that he has no calling to supply material for publication; and if one has a practical hand, why not use it for the edification of the Church?

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. X. JUNE, 1890. NO. 3.

GODLINESS AND BUSINESS.

Notwithstanding the strenuous efforts that are made to introduce the leaven of the Gospel into the mass of humanity, and the success which has attended these efforts in the numerical growth of the Church, the world's business is still organized on a basis and conducted on principles that suggest many a doubt and render many a Christian conscience uneasy. There is nothing discouraging in this. The mass to be leavened is large and the counteracting forces are many. It would accord neither with reason nor with revelation to expect that the transforming work of the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ would be accomplished as soon as the kingdom of God is established in a community. The world and the flesh and the devil still exist, and the number of those who stand opposed to them and wage a resolute warfare against them is always comparatively small. No weapon is given into the hands of the enemy by the admission that our conquest is not yet complete. But it should act as an incentive to inquire whether Christians have not been content with partial victories where larger results are possible, and whether many precious souls are not endangered by their needless exposure to the wiles of the foe. It should not seem a little thing to us to preserve in His fold those for whom Christ died and to secure such a state of society as would be helpful toward gathering in others.

Obviously those Christians are pursuing an unwise course who are content to have business regarded and treated as a matter lying wholly outside of Christianity and therefore not subject to its influence. That is the pernicious error which has very appropriately been called Sunday religion, as distinguished from the godliness which is profitable unto all things and manifests itself as well in the every day work of life as in the worship of God's house. A faith that does not purify the heart and result in a life of submission to the Lord's will is a mere product of sinful nature and has no saving power. That is not Christianity, however loud may be its Sunday professions. The man who lives unto himself all the day and all the week, and thinks the claims of God upon him are fully satisfied by a few moments' devotional exercises daily and an hour's participation in divine service weekly, has not yet turned from the slavery of sin to the liberty of God's children. His professions are vain, "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." 2 Tim. 3, 5. Our Lord gives us the solemn warning: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 7, 21. He requires our hearts, not merely hollow words and heartless actions which have a semblance of conformity to His will. When the heart is the Lord's there can be no thought of withdrawing the greatest portion of the life from His service; "because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead, and that He died for all, that they which live should henceforth not live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them and rose again." 2 Cor. 5, 14. 15. That must needs embrace the whole life because it embraces the whole person with all his powers. "This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men." Tit. 3, 8.

One of the gross errors from which the light of the Reformation freed Christ's true disciples is the figment that the good works which are required are something distinct from the daily walk and work in men's callings according to the divine ordinance. Under the papacy "traditions obscured the commandments of God, because traditions were preferred far above them. All Christianity was thought to be an observance of certain holidays, rites, fasts, and attire. These observances were in possession of a most goodly title, that they were the spiritual life and—a perfect life. In the mean time God's commandments touching every man's calling were of small estimation: that the father brought up his children, that the mother nurtured them, that the prince governed the commonwealth. These were reputed worldly affairs, and imperfect, and far inferior to those glittering observances. And this error did greatly torment pious consciences, which were grieved that they were held by an imperfect kind of life, in marriages, in magistracy, or in other civil functions. They had the morals and such like in admiration, and falsely imagined that the observances of these men were more grateful to God than their own." Apology, Art. 26, § 8–12. Because the service which men are to render one another in love was lightly regarded, human devices were introduced in which extraordinary sanctity could seemingly be displayed, and obedience to these human ordinances was of course considered a perfection to which the common Christian, who plowed fields, sold produce, made shoes, built houses, could not attain, though he did honest work and rendered service to his fellow-men. "The commandments of God and the true worship of God are obscured, when men hear that monks alone are in that state of perfection; because that Christian perfection is this, to fear God sincerely, and again, to conceive great faith and to trust assuredly that God is pacified toward us for Christ's sake; to ask and certainly to look for help from God in all our affairs, according to our calling; and outwardly to do good works

diligently and to attend to our vocation. In these things doth true perfection and the true worship of God consist; it doth not consist in singleness of life, in beggary, or in vile apparel." *Augsb. Conf.* Art. 27, § 49. 50.

Romanism depreciated the works of men's temporal calling and substituted for them certain human ordinances in the observance of which holiness should be attained. The matter has a better appearance when arts of worship which God has commanded, or the works of our spiritual calling, are emphasized as the true service of God, in which alone the divine life has its proper expression, to the exclusion of all labor in the temporal vocation. But the root of all evil is the same. The underlying error in both cases is that the duties of the second table of the law, because they are secondary, are not divinely enjoined, and that when a service is rendered to man, though it be divinely commanded, it is not a service of God, and especially not when the service rendered has reference merely to the body and its temporal wants. Now, it is true that the works done in the various vocations of earthly life are not necessarily good works. A man is not, in the Scripture sense, a good man because he has ruled the country well or fought its battles well, because he has been industrious and supported his family well, because he has manufactured good wares and dealt honestly in trade. A man could do that without being a child of God through faith and an heir of heaven in Christ Jesus. But it is merely a confusion of ideas when on this account the works of the temporal calling are regarded as no part of the service which God requires of His people and which He graciously accepts. The same can be alleged of the works of the heavenly calling. Reading the Bible, receiving the sacrament, hearing the preaching of the Word, public and private praying, can all be attended to without being a Christian. None of them is in itself a good work in the sense of Holy Scripture. In both cases the work is good when it is done in the name of Jesus by the

power of grace, in neither case is it good when done by the unbeliever from motives suggested by our corrupt nature. There is no ground whatever for relegating the work of men's temporal vocation to the sphere of the carnal, or even of speaking lightly of it, as at best merely indifferent, while only that which pertains directly to the worship of God or the salvation of the soul is lauded as exclusively a work of righteousness which glorifies His name and is accepted of Him as good. A work is good when it executes the Lord's will, whether that will pertain to this life or that which is to come. In all things the Lord is Master and we are servants. Therefore "whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by Him." Col. 3, 17. It is a wanton disregard or perversion of the Word of God to make the life of business, which occupies the largest share of men's attention and time in this earthly pilgrimage, an exception to the divine rule of stewardship and service by which God's praises are to be set forth." Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." 1 Cor. 10, 31. In all we may do good or do evil, and for all we must give account.

Not only is it necessary to return, in these evil days, to the doctrines of the Reformation in regard to the absence of merit in all good works, but also in regard to what constitutes them. "Ours are falsely accused of forbidding good works," says our Augsburg Confession. "For their writings extant upon the ten commandments, and others of the like argument, do bear witness that they have to good purpose taught concerning every kind of life and its duties; what kinds of life and what works in every calling do please God. Of which things preachers in former times taught little or nothing: only they urged certain childish and needless works; as, keeping of holidays, set fasts, fraternities, pilgrimages, worshiping of saints, the use of rosaries, monkery, and such like things." *Art.* 20. "Thus we have the ten commandments," says our Large Catechism, "a compend of

divine doctrine as to what we shall do that our whole life may be pleasing to God, and the true fountain and channel from and in which everything must flow that is to be considered a good work, as that outside of these ten commandments no work or thing can be good or pleasing to God, however great or precious it may be in the eyes of the world. Let us see now what our great saints can boast of their spiritual orders and their great and grievous works which they have invented and set up, with the omission of those of the commandments, as though they were of far too little consequence or were long ago perfectly fulfilled. I am of opinion that here any one will find his hands full, and will have enough to do to observe these; viz. meekness, patience and love to enemies, chastity, kindness, etc., and what such virtues imply. But such works are not of value and make no display in the eyes of the world; for they are not unusual and ambitious and restricted to particular times, places, customs, and postures, but are common, every-day domestic works which one neighbor can practice toward another, and therefore they are not of high esteem. But the other ranks claim the astonished attention of men, being aided by their great display, expense, and magnificent buildings, and these they so adorn that everything shines and glitters; they waft incense, they sing and ring bells, they light tapers and candles, so that nothing else can be seen or heard. For it is regarded a most precious work which no one can sufficiently praise if a priest stand there in a surplice embroidered with gilt, or a layman continue all day on his knees in church. But if a poor girl tend a little child and faithfully do what she is told, that is nothing; for else what should monks and nuns seek in their cloisters?" *Part* 1 *Concl.* Whatever a man's station or calling may be, there he is to do in faith and love what his hands find to do, and that is leading a life of holiness that is pleasing in God's sight.

Luther repeatedly directs attention to this subject of serving God in the temporal vocation which His providence

has assigned. In a sermon on John 21, 19–24 he says: "Without reference to all the holy examples and lives, each one should attend to that which is commanded him and considers his vocation. O, that is a necessary, salutary doctrine. It is a common error to look at the works and observing their conversation think that it would be a precious thing to follow them. This is fostered and furthered by the vain babblers who preach the lives of the dear saints and do not rightly present them as an example to the people. Against this Christ here acts and speaks. Peter is a type of these people. When Christ commanded that he should follow Him, he turns about and looks after another, and concerns himself as to where he is going whom Jesus loved. So these men do; they let that lie which is commanded them and look to the works and ways of others whom God loves, who are His saints. Therefore Christ takes him to task and says, What is that to thee, whither he goes? Follow thou me, and let me attend to the other. If I will that he tarry, wilt thou therefore tarry also? Thinkest thou that I will have the same of thee as of him? Not so. Do what I ask of thee; the other will find his proper sphere. I desire many servants, but they are not all to have the same work. Thus we find many people who do all sorts of things except that which they are commanded to do. Many a one hears that some saints have gone on pilgrimages for which they are praised, and at once the fool leaves wife and child, of whom God has commanded him to take care, goes to St. James' or some other place, and does not notice that his calling is entirely different from that of the saint whom he follows. So they do with institutions, fasts, apparel, holidays, and the whole business of priests, monks, and nuns. It is all looking back to the disciples whom Jesus loves, and turning away from the command and call to follow Christ, though they call it all right because they thus follow the saints. Therefore look well to the straight path which God appoints. In the first place, He will not tolerate human

doctrines and ways and commandments. In the second place, He will not endure works of man's own choice. In the third place, He will not permit the example of saints to be the rule of life, but each one is to wait for God's direction, what He would have him do, as the prophet says, that God shall teach them in the way that He shall choose and that He will teach the weak His way. Ps. 25, 8–12. But you may say, How if I am not called, what shall I do then? My answer is, How could it be possible that you should not be called? You are in some condition: you are a husband or wife or child or servant. Consider the humblest state. If you are a husband, do you think that you have not enough to do in this state to govern wife, child, servant and goods, that everything may be done in obedience to God and that no wrong be done to any one? Yea, though you had four heads and ten hands you would still not be sufficient for these things, so that you would have no room for pilgrimages and saintly works of such a sort. Again, if you are a son or daughter, do you think that you have not enough to do to preserve your youth in purity, chastity and temperance, to obey your parents, and injure no man in word or work? Nay, because it has gone out of fashion to heed such command and calling, people have taken to praying rosaries and doing things that do not pertain to their calling, and no one thinks of paying any regard to his state." "As there is no person without command and calling, so there is none without works, if he wants to do right. If each one is intent to remain in his place and state, take heed to himself, look to the command given him, and serve God in it and keep His precepts, he will have so much to do that all his time will seem too short, all his field too narrow, and all his powers too feeble. For the evil spirit makes fierce assaults upon these ways and renders them bitter to men, so that they are loth to continue in them. But if he succeeds in getting one to forget and abandon his calling, he no longer tempts him so severely; he has led him out of the

highway, and occasionally lets him find a grass-path or board-walk, that is, lets him do a little good work belonging to another; then the fool imagines he is going right, thinks of great merit in heaven, wanders further and further from the road, until he falls into the scandalous frenzy that God cares for the work, as was the case with Saul. No, dear man, God is not concerned about the work, but about obedience, as it is written: 'Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice.' 1 Sam. 15, 22. Hence it is that a pious maid-servant, if she performs what is commanded and in her calling sweeps the yard or carries out slops, or a man-servant, if he in such obedience plows the field or drives the wagon, is on the direct road to heaven, while another goes to St. James or to church, lets his calling and work take care of itself, and walks on the way to hell. Therefore we must close our eyes and not regard works, whether they are great or small, honored or despised, spiritual or corporeal, or whatever may be their esteem and name on earth, but look at the command and obedience involved; if this is found in it, the work is also truly precious and entirely divine, even if it were so insignificant as picking up a straw. But if there is no obedience and command, the work is evil, damnable, devilish, even if it were so great as raising the dead. For this is settled, that God's eyes regard not the work, but obedience in the work. Hence He will have us look to His command and call, of which St. Paul says: 'As God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk?' 1 Cor. 7, 17. And St. Peter: 'As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.' 1 Pet. 4, 10."

"You will say, Why, should we then not follow the example of saints? Why then do we preach about them? I answer that we should so preach about them that God may be praised and we may be incited also to comfort ourselves in His goodness and grace, that so not the works, but the obedience in them may be set forth. But now it is the custom

to leave obedience out of view, and to lead us so deeply into works that obedience is entirely overlooked, and while we gape with mouths wide open at works we despise our own command and calling. Therefore it is unquestionably the devil's device that the service of God is restricted to church, altar, mass, singing, reading, sacrifices, and such like, as if other works were in vain or utterly useless. How could the devil have more successfully led us from the right way than by thus narrowing the service of God and confining it to the church and the works performed there." *Works Erl. ed. Vol.* 10, 233–38.

This is teaching that is needful now as well as it was in Luther's day. The whole doctrine of good works and a holy life challenges renewed study. Not all is clear when it is shown that works have no merit and that salvation is by faith without the deeds of the law. It is necessary that this should be set forth with all plainness and perseverance, for evidently many Christians have not understood it or have not believed it, and holy living as well as peace of conscience suffers from the defect. Where the freedom which comes through the Gospel apprehended by faith is wanting, true holiness is out of the question. There is no force in the soul to produce it and no foundation upon which it could stand. But when there is a recognition of the blessed truth that we are saved by grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, which is embraced alone by faith and to which our works can contribute nothing and need contribute nothing, the doctrine of good works is not rendered superfluous. The subject is not exhausted by exhibiting what is not their office and what they cannot accomplish. They are still necessary and Christian people must give them due attention. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in

them." Eph. 2, 8–10. That always was the will of God that we should own Him as our Lord and serve Him in cheerful obedience. To this end He redeemed us, that we should be released from the bondage and misery into which sin had brought us under a foreign master, "that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him all the days of our life." Luke 1, 74. 75. Therefore "let our's also learn to maintain good works for necessary uses, that they be not unfruitful." Tit. 3, 14. And let not the disloyal thought be entertained for a moment, that now the Christian, since he is freed from the chains wherewith Satan had bound him, can be his own master and do what he pleases. That is the mistake of libertines of every hue, that the gospel has made us free from the service of God as well as from subjection to the bondage of Satan and of men. We have not so learned Christ. "For when ye were the servants of sin ye were free from righteousness. What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? For the end of those things is death. But now being made free from sin and become servants of God, ye have your fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life." Rom. 6, 20–22. Hence the plaudit is given those who continue steadfast until the end, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." Matt. 25, 21.

It is therefore an error that has far-reaching consequences to assume that all business affairs, to which not only as a matter of fact but also a matter of right, men devote the largest portion of their working hours, lie outside of the sphere of duty and belong to the sphere of the indifferent, in regard to which every man can do what is good in his own sight. There is something else which the Christian must consider in this regard besides the question what suits his pleasure and what is pecuniarily profitable. He is to do the will of God. And this will is not only that he shall confess Christ, go to church, hear and read the Word, receive

the sacraments, pray, contribute money and devote time to the work of the church, and, in short, do all that pertains to his spiritual calling as an heir of heaven who rejoices in the hope of the glory of God, but that he shall serve the Lord during his earthly privilege in the station which God has assigned Him and the calling which God has given him. And that does not mean simply that each one, if he chooses a profession, shall conduct it according to the will of God, and that when he has chosen an occupation, shall observe the ten commandments in his work as in his worship, but that his time and his talents are God's and that he therefore is not free to work or not to work as may suit his pleasure, or to devote his gifts to that which affords him the greatest gratification. He is not his own master; if he is a Christian he is a servant of God and is intent upon serving his Lord in all things. "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another." Gal. 5, 13. "Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love, in honor preferring one another, not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." Rom. 12, 10. 11. "When we were with you this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busy-bodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work and eat their own bread." 2 Thess. 3, 10–12. God uses the manifold gifts which He has bestowed upon men to subserve His purposes, and by His providence assigns to each his place and his work. That is the place in which and the work by which he is to render service. That is the calling which God has given him and in which he is to be found faithful. The Christian does not think of great achievements in the world by which he is to display superior holiness. "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called." 1 Cor. 7, 20. That, whatever it may be, is

high enough and good enough for him, seeing it is the calling which God has given and in which He desires the imparted gift to be used. There he is to live a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness, doing good works all the time because doing his heavenly Father's will and satisfied with his heavenly Father's blessing. To neglect the work which is to be done in that calling, under the plea that it is secular work and the soul sighs for something nobler and more spiritual, is to seek sanctity in the work and not in obedience. Worship is needful and good, but it is not a good work when a man lets his business go to rack and his family come to want in order to devote his time to it, as it is not a good work to labor in his temporal calling when he ought to be engaged in worship. There's time for both, and it is only the wrong state of heart that stands in the way of attending faithfully to both, each in its proper season. In both the will of God is to be done.

Temporal business is therefore not to be placed outside of the sphere of duty as a matter distinct from the Christian life, but must be regarded as an important part of it. We are to serve the Lord not only in our religious devotions, but in all things, by no means excepting our business affairs. And not only are we to serve God by striving to keep His commandments in the manner of conducting our business, but the business itself is to be such a service. Not only are we to do honest work and deal honestly with our wares, but the work done is to be a work of obedience to the divine will, performed in the name of the Lord Jesus and redounding to the glory of God. Whatever cannot find a proper place in this category is not a thing to engage the Christian's attention and occupy the Christian's time. He has no divine call to it and therefore no promise of blessing in it. He wants to serve God in a state of good works, and he recognizes no service of God in self-chosen ways and no good works in self-chosen occupations. But he does recognize labor as an ordinance of God by which men can in love

serve one another, and engages in the work of his calling in obedience to the will of God who assigned it and who will bless it.

But is not business a matter of indifference in itself, in which men may engage if they please and when they please and as they please, provided only that, if they do engage in it, they conduct it without violating the decalogue? May a man not, if he has enough to live on, consult his own inclination and wishes about the matter of labor and business? If one is rich, why should he work unless he has pleasure in it? And if one has a chance to get rich, may he not abandon his calling to seize the opportunity presented? And having embraced it and amassed a fortune, may he not take it easy for the rest of his life and enjoy the fruits of his success? The answer of the Bible is more easily found than accepted. No man liveth unto himself. No man is his own lord. No one is independent of God who made us and to whom we must all give account. He exempts those from labor who are physically or mentally disqualified to perform it. But He never makes the gaining of a livelihood the ground for engaging in it or the possession of a competence a ground for desisting from it. He provides, and does not need any man's work to enable Him to provide. But He wills that men should use for the common good the gifts which He has bestowed, and that men should by love serve one another and thus accomplish His purpose on earth. It is absurd to suppose that because a man is rich he need not perform any service. Why should the Lord exempt rich men from duties imposed upon all? All the distinction they have is that they have larger gifts and therefore larger duties. "Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required." Luke 12, 48. Responsibilities increase with the increase of talents and opportunities. No man can do as he pleases: the Lord will call each one to account, and reward him according to his works. No true Christian wants merely to please himself. He wants to

serve his Lord. But what a caricature of Christianity is it not to pretend that this implies only a little spiritual devotion mornings and evenings, and in going to church on Sundays! Those who think that the requirements of God's Word are fulfilled and all necessary service is rendered to God by such occasional acts have reason to examine themselves whether they be in the faith. If our Christianity is to be the power in the community that God designs it to be, its preachers must have a more adequate conception of its nature than that. It is a divine power of grace in Christ that saves from death and damnation, and renders the saved willing servants of the Savior, whom it is a pleasure to serve in righteousness. "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." Rom. 12, 1. 2.

There are many things left to the choice of God's children, who serve Him in the cheerfulness of liberty and gratitude. But whether men will serve Him or live unto themselves is not a matter over which man has jurisdiction. That is a question of ultimate life or death. "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." Rom. 8, 13. We either live under Christ in His kingdom and serve Him, in business matters as in everything else, or we are yet in the devil's chains and slavishly serve him in our business and therefore in everything else, even in our worship, which then has the form of godliness but denies the power thereof. There is no state of indifference in this regard, no middle ground between Christ and Belial. If we do not serve God we serve the devil. Therefore it is all a mistake to suppose that business matters belong to a sphere with which Christianity has nothing to do, and that only the means of sal-

vation and the worship in spirit and in truth belong to its domain. Both are subject to the will of God, and a holy life is a life according to that will in every department of human activity. Men usually carry on their business for selfish ends and earnestly seek the mammon of unrighteousness; but that is no reason why Christians should be guilty of the sin. They are not called to follow the ways of the world, but to follow Christ, "by whom the world is crucified unto me and I unto the world." Gal. 6, 14. "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." 1 John 2, 15–17. The Christian lives to do that will and does not suffer the thought to find a lodgment in his soul, that that will has nothing to do with his temporal calling, or that in matters of business he can be subject to a different lord without damaging his Christianity. "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other: ye cannot serve God and mammon." Matt. 6, 24.

We need not be told that a large proportion of business men are not Christians, and that therefore it would be unreasonable to expect that all would pursue it on Christian principles. Nor need we be reminded that the work of temporal callings is of such a nature that it can be performed not only by the regenerate, but also by the unregenerate, and that a separation for business purposes between those who are for Christ and those who are against Him is not in accordance with what the Scriptures teach concerning the church and the world. The Church has not the calling to till the soil, manufacture goods, bring wares to market, and thus minister to the wants of the body. That is secular business about which not only Christians are con-

cerned. But some manifestly do need to be told that if these things do not belong to the jurisdiction of the Church, they do belong to the jurisdiction of the Lord whom Christians recognize and serve, and that He requires of us obedience. Therefore the Christian will go to his daily work as well as to church in the Lord's name, and will do what his hands find to do in his calling because the Lord wants him to do it and it is required of a steward that a man be found faithful. And it needs to be repeated that such faithfulness requires not only honesty in all business transactions, but doing the business which Providence has assigned to such, not for gold or honors, but for the Lord's sake, in the Lord's name, and for the Lord's glory. If this is not the way of the world, the more is the pity. It is the way of the Lord, and business men must make up their minds whether they will walk in the ways of the Lord or choose the broad road that seems to lead on to fortune, but ends in eternal ruin.

The argument is not new to us that such a view of business is utterly impracticable, and that its prevalence would remove all motives for business enterprise and cripple all trade and commerce. We cannot say that we never thought of that. It has been urged often enough to keep it before thinking minds. But we can say that it is of a sort for which we have no respect. If the Lord's will is done, what need a Christian care about its effect on business circles? Let markets go up or go down, let trade increase or diminish, what is that to us so long as we know that the Lord of all is working out His gracious thoughts, which mean blessing to mankind? Opponents must not expect to make any impression upon believing Christians by setting their wisdom against the wisdom of the Lord. Such arguments from expediency count for nothing with those who wait confidently upon the Lord and know that His ways are right and never fail to be salutary. Moreover, such an argument is wholly at fault even when considered from a merely

human point of view. For no considerate man would assume that because Christians decline to recognize the selfish motives which actuate worldly-minded business men, therefore worldly-minded business men would cease to be actuated by their selfish motives, and in consequence would quit their business. They will go on in their pursuit of riches all the same. But Christians have something else to move them, and so far as the work of grace has renewed their souls it moves them powerfully. They want to do the Lord's will, "by love serving one another." That brings business on its right basis and renders it effectual in the accomplishment of its ends. It is time Christians were deciding whether in their business they will serve the Lord, to whom they must give an account of their stewardship, or whether they will serve mammon. M. Loy.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DREAM.

FIRST ARTICLE.

Some 40 years ago the main attacks of naturalistic criticism were directed against the New Testament canon. Baur and his school, in the sweat of their brow and the bitterness of their unbelieving heart, tried to prove that the inspiration of the N. T. was an exploded fable, that most of the books of the N. T. canon were not written by the Evangelists and Apostles, but were forgeries of later centuries. This Tuebingen school created an immense stir in theological circles, and many weak-kneed Christians were taken in by this false philosophy and lost the faith in Christ and His word. But this vicious attack soon called forth a vigorous and successful defense of the Church and her Gospel. The "pia fraus" imputed to the sainted church-fathers turned out to be nothing but an impious fraud of Baur, Strauss, Renan and Co. The mad bull of N. T. criticism

lost his horns, though, of course, he retained his madness. Being utterly vanquished on the one side of the old stronghold, unbelief, like a true child of Satan, attacked the other. If Christ, the real rock of offence, could not be felled by a direct blow; if He could invite and stand even the sharpest scrutiny of His Gospel: Moses might, perchance, prove a weaker enemy. "Let us kill Moses," now became the war cry; unsuspecting Christians may be willing to give him up, while they refuse to lose Christ. The plan is worthy of the old serpent that hatched it. If Moses is not the author of the books named after him; if he did not establish that grand system of the Jewish religion; if he did not, as the greatest prophet of the Old Testament, reveal the law of God unto Israel: Christ is either a dupe or a deceiver, because He claimed to believe in the Pentateuch of Moses.

The enmity of the natural heart, the main-spring of all unbelief, is of course, at the bottom of Wellhausen's new theory, that is finding so many friends among the liberal theologians of America. But the mode of attack is a somewhat novel one. Evolution, that baby of pantheism, was sent forth by the critics to kill the Mosaic Goliath. The pebble that filled its little sling was the following syllogism: All other systems of religion have, like the nations themselves, been gradually developed by poets and sages, from the savage fetish worship to the beautiful Grecian Olympus, the noble German Walhalla and the all-surpassing Indian Nirwana; the Jewish religion is essentially the same as all others: consequently that grand structure of religion laid down in the Pentateuch cannot have been erected by Moses at the very birth of the Jewish nation, but must have been built many centuries later, when Israel had grown to be a man and knew what it was about. The finding of the law books in Josiah's time, when the long, bloody tyranny of the heathenish Manasseh had effaced even the memory of that treasure, as well it might, is seized upon as a beautiful chance to smuggle Moses, horns and all, into the Jewish

church. The stupendous fraud which the pious, God-fearing priest must have practiced, according to Wellhausen's theory, is swallowed by the critics as easily as the impossible assumption that the author of such a mighty work, the like of which is found nowhere among other nations, should have been an anonymous person, of whose literary labors even his nearest friends had no idea. This last difficulty has led other critics to charge Ezekiel with the authorship of the main portions of Moses. Ezekiel, whose force as a writer even the infidel Schiller praised in the highest terms, would indeed be a man for such a work, as far as the ability is concerned. The eagle spirit of Moses was in him, and, being a priest, he was thoroughly versed in the Pentateuch, as many portions of his own book bear evidence. But, as is generally the case with such "higher criticism," the one theory flatly contradicts the other. Ezekiel was led captive to Babylon 598 B. C., and labored among his countrymen long after the destruction of Jerusalem in 588. Granting him a good old age, he could not have been more than a mere stripling at the time of Josiah's reformation, which took place about 625 B. C. Even our American new theology men, who generally swallow German rationalism tooth and nail, would hardly entrust a boy with the composition of the Pentateuch. Did such a coarse sophistry as the evolution theory applied to the Jewish religion ever find so many advocates? The real thing these critics want to prove, is the human origin of the Bible, in this particular case, of the Jewish religion. Proof: All human religions are gradually developed; the Jewish religion is nothing but a human religion; therefore it must have developed from low beginnings at Moses' time to higher ends in Josiah's time, and not vice versa, as the Bible would have us believe. The question is boldly begged, the thing to be proven is assumed with the most innocent face as an established fact, and human reason boasts of having at last overthrown the inspiration of the Bible. The major premise of the syllo-

gism is true; all human religious systems have been gradually developed: the Jewish religion alone was born into the world as a full grown man, proving by the very time of its establishment its divine origin. Even a child with an unbiased mind would ask: does not the very fact that the Jewish religion differs radically from all other religions prove that it must have a different source? But the unbelieving critic, starting from the altogether uncritical maxim, that divine revelation to man is an impossibility, wearies his confused brain in trying to turn history upside down in order to find some kind of an excuse for his infidelity. We notice that it is, after all, the same old enmity of the unregenerate heart against the miracles of the Bible, that directs the attacks against the Pentateuch. The stronger the proofs for divine revelation, the firmer the seal of God's hand upon any book of the Bible, the fiercer will be the onslaughts of the enemy to degrade this book to the level of mere human productions.

This holds good in full measure with regard to the wonderful book of Daniel. It is, indeed, a book full of wonders of divine omnipotence over against the mighty heathen ruler that had conquered Israel, and, in his self-deification, believed that he had conquered also its God. It is a book full of wonders of divine omniscience that puts to shame the boasted wisdom and vainglory of the heathen magicians, astrologers, sorcerers, and Chaldeans. These miracles are naturally distasteful to the miracle-hating "higher-critic." More especially distasteful to him are those prophecies of Daniel which describe not only in general outlines the future events of the great empires of the world, but even dare to go into particulars in the case of Antiochus Epiphanes, the O. T. Antichrist. If Daniel, who according to the Bible, lived in Babylon from 600 until about 530 B. C., really wrote those prophecies about the Syrian and Egyptian wars and treaties and marriages, which occurred from 300 to 400 years later, all the "higher," the "scientific"

critics would have to come down to the poor, despised belief of Christians, that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," 2 Pet. 1, 21. This dreadful confession must be avoided at any risk, lest infidels should be forced already in this life to close their unholy lips against God and His Word. What wonder that the book of Daniel has been assailed in the fiercest manner by heathens and Christians that are little better than heathens. Perhaps no single book of the Bible has called forth so many violent attacks as the book of Daniel. Already the Platonist Porphyrius, who lived 300 years after Christ, in the 12th book of his work against Christianity, made the assertion that the book of Daniel was not written by the Daniel of the exile, but by a Jew of the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, who did not predict future events, but did relate things past; and whenever he did prophecy, his predictions were false. This heathen criticism was gladly excavated by Semler, Teller, Eichhorn, Bleek, and other Rationalists and today it is taken for a settled fact by the liberal theologians that such a Daniel as our book presents, and such visions as it relates, never existed. Some have gone so far as to deny the existence of Daniel the prophet altogether, changing him into a legendary hero of the mythical ages of whom not even a trace remained among his people, while his name was taken by an obscure writer of Maccabee times who wanted to cheer his struggling people in their war against Antiochus. It is not our object now to follow the "higher critics" into all the labyrinths of their doubts and denial; but in passing we shall briefly note the grave charges that are brought against the book of Daniel, in order to show how even the heaviest shot of the enemy fall short of touching this stronghold of divine revelation.

In the first place, the fact that the O. T. canon does not put Daniel among the prophets, but among the Hegiagraphs, between Esther and Ezra, is urged as a proof against the authenticity of the book. But does not the fact that Daniel

is found in the canon at all prove incontrovertably that the great Synagogue which established the canon, believed the book of Daniel to be inspired, not to speak of the fact that the O. T. canon was finished about 400 years before Christ while Antiochus Epiphanes devastated Judea from 170 to 163? The argument is absolutely in favor of the historical Daniel at Babylon and his prophecy. Nor is the seeming difficulty of the position hard to explain. Daniel never labored among his people as all the other prophets did, who were far more preachers than prophets in the sense we generally attach to that term. The Talmud expressly denies that Daniel was a prophet. He was not an official prophet sent to the people of God. Some call him a visionary or apocalyptic seer, because he was not sent to his time, but received revelation for the future only. We do not attach much importance to this distinction; the Christian church was undoubtedly right in classing Daniel with the prophets. The position of the book is fully explained by the peculiar idea of the great Synagogue which firmly believed in Daniel and his book.

Furthermore, the historical dates of the book are said to be false. The very first verse is said to contain a palpable error. We read Dan. 1, 1: "In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon unto Jerusalem and besieged it." But in Jerem. 25, 1 we are told that in the 4th year of Jehoiakim Jeremiah warned the people of Nebuchadnezzar's coming. Now if the first verse would read: Nebuchadnezzar arrived in the 3d year, etc., there would be no great difficulty. But the Hebrew word used for "came" generally means "to go forth," to start, and that solves the whole difficulty. In the 3d year of Jehoiakim Nebuchadnezzar began his great war against Pharaoh Necho of Egypt, who had advanced against Assyria. Finding Nineveh destroyed in the meantime he had directed his arms against the Babylonians and taken the fortress of Carchemish (Ceriesuin). Against him Ne-

buchadnezzar, as yet under his father Nabopalassar, according to the Greek historian Berosus, raised an army and defeated him 606 at Ceriesuin, in the 3d year of Jehoiakim. If this latter took place in the fall of the year we may well believe that another year passed by before Nebuchadnezzar, after conquering all Syria, came to Jerusalem on his pursuit of the Egyptian. If Jerusalem was taken near the end of 605, Jeremiah had plenty of time to utter his warning as cited above. That Daniel, who passed most of his lifetime in Babylon, where he also wrote his book, should mention the beginning of the first great war of Nebuchadnezzar, seems but natural. In the 3d year of Jehoiakim Nebuchadnezzar "went forth." But another difficulty is raised. Daniel seems to contradict himself. Dan. 2, 1 says that Nebuchadnezzar had his dream in the 2d year of his kingdom. But Daniel and his friends were educated in all the wisdom of the Chaldeans before they were presented to the king. What a glaring contradiction with Dan. 1. 1, where Nebuchadnezzar is already called king the error-hunting critic cries triumphantly. A closer reflection would tell him at once that any writer of common sense would hardly contradict himself so glaringly from one chapter to the other. True enough, if Nebuchadnezzar ruled Babylon already at thirteen, when he went forth to battle with Pharaoh Necho, or even when a year later he took Jerusalem and led Daniel captive, the dream could not have occurred in the 2d year of the great king's reign. But the difficulty is only seeming. Berosus solves the question. Nebuchadnezzar was indeed leader of the army, perhaps viceroy of the realm during the last year of his aged father's reign, and therefore could, by a common prolepsis, be properly described as king, especially by the people of Judea, who might not even know the name of Nabopalassar. But when in later years Daniel writes up his experiences at tbe court of Babylon, he counts the actual reign of the king.

Another objection is raised on account of the different languages used in our book. Chapters 2, 4 till 7 inclusive are written in the Chaldaic language, while the rest is in Hebrew. One critic claims that this proves that Daniel was not the author, because one writer would not use two languages in the same book. If Daniel had written it, he certainly would have used the old holy Hebrew. At the times of the Maccabees the Aramaic, similar to the Chaldaic, had become the language of the Jewish people and therefore only a writer of Antiochus' times would be likely to write in Chaldaic. These critics only forget that the common people understood no Hebrew at the times of the Maccabees; a writer who wanted to enthuse soldiers with pretended predictions of Daniel about their time, would hardly use a language they did not understand. Other critics, feeling the force of this, jumped to the opposite conclusion, that the pious forger had intentionally used both languages, in order to make his book seem very old. Here, as elsewhere, the language used, instead of weakening Daniel's claim to the authorship, greatly strengthens it. Soon after the exile, or rather during the same, the ancient Hebrew died out and the Syrian dialect of Aramaic took its place, being very similar to the Chaldaic learned in Babylon. At no other time were the two languages spoken together, much as English and German in our own country, except in the times of Daniel, who certainly mastered them both. Besides the Chaldaic portions of his book treat of the universal monarchy and its development and are naturally written in the language of that empire. The second portion, (as also the introduction) treating more especially of the kingdom of God and its development, is written in the holy language of the O. T. The book forming a well arranged whole is evidently written by one man, and that man was Daniel.

Again, the Greek names of some musical instruments, the psaltery, harp, etc. are held out as proofs for the later

composition of Daniel's book at a time when Greek was the universal language of the East. A rather far-fetched argument. If one book had been composed at the times of Antiochus, it would probably have been written entirely in the Greek language, as was the Apocryphal book of the O. T. And was there so little intercourse between Greece and Babylon, that great city of commerce, whose mantles were found in Judea even at Joshua's time, as to find the use of names of three or four Greek instruments an impossibility?

According to Strabo, a Greek named Antimenedes, was a leader in Nebuchadnezzar's army, probably commanding Greek mercenaries. The Assyrian kings even employed Greek soldiers. An instrument similar to a psaltery was even found by the excavators on one of the reliefs in Nineveh, a city that was destroyed before Daniel came to Babylon.

Also the prophet Ezekiel is called upon to overthrow his great contemporary. Ezek. 14, 14 Noah, Daniel and Job are mentioned as examples of righteousness and Ezek. 28, 3 Daniel's wisdom is extolled above that of the king of Tyre. This praise of Daniel by Ezekiel is said to prove that the former must have been some ancient sage, not a contemporary of Ezekiel. As Daniel would have been a comparatively young man at that time, Ezekiel's praise would seem unnatural according to the critics. But let us remember that the first mention of Daniel by Ezekiel took place 11 years after the former had been made chief of the governors over all the wise men at Babylon. Is it any wonder that the name and fame of this wonderful man was great among his exiled people at that time? They naturally felt proud of their great countryman that ruled at the king's court while they themselves were captives. The very fables that weave a halo of glory around his name, as we find them in the additions to his book in the Alexandrine translation, in the later Jewish Haggada, among the church fathers, and even among Mohammedan writers, bear

witness of the mighty impression which his life and work left upon his time and country. The prophet Ezekiel stands as one of the firmest figures of the O. T., even among naturalistic critics. How could he have mentioned Daniel in this manner, if Daniel had been unknown to the people?

Again, the heaping of seemingly unnecessary miracles and the colossal character of some of them is adduced as proof against the veracity of the writer of this book. Only a miracle-craving age like that of the Maccabees is said to be able to produce such ridiculous stories. That brings us nearer to the main objection raised against the book. The cloven hoof peeps out from under the mantle of critical science. Miracles of any kind are for the unbeliever what the red rag is to the bull. Whatever is said about the miracles as being gross, unnecessary, heaped, will only prove the truth of Daniel's authorship and divine revelation. All turning points in the history of God's kingdom are marked by mighty signs and wonders. Think of Moses, Elijah and Elisha, Christ. The captivity was a great turning point in the history of God's people. Its liberty was lost. David's earthly kingdom was broken, never to be restored. We would naturally expect just such a book at such a time. The mighty wonders of divine wisdom and power were as necessary for the uplifting of the despairing people as for the humbling of the heaven-storming rulers of that time. Or does any one suppose that Cyrus would have permitted Israel to return and Jerusalem to be rebuilt—that defiant stronghold, which had been a thorn in the flesh of Assyria and Babylon alike,—if the fear of Jehovah had not wrung his edict from him? Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius, Cyrus, knew Jehovah as little as the Pharaoh of the exodus had known Him. As all heathens judged the gods of nations according to the success in war, Jehovah was deeply despised by the worshippers of Bell and the followers of Zarathustra, who held Israel captive. God had to perform miracles; not, indeed, in order to punish as in Egypt, but in order to con-

vince; for Nebuchadnezzar had only carried out the will of Jehovah, when he destroyed Jerusalem. Not by sending plagues did Jehovah glorify His name in Babylon, but by delivering His servants from fire and lions.

And now for the main fault found with our book. In the case of Antiochus Epiphanes Daniel goes into particulars. He not only predicts the coming of the Persian, the Greek, the Syrian and Egyptian monarchies, but also the wars between the Seleucides and Plalemeans, down to the heathen abomination which Antiochus Epiphanes raised up in the very temple at Jerusalem. A Christian child would smilingly ask: should it be impossible for the Spirit of God to know little things before hand, while He knows great coming events? But that is not the question with the critics. They mean to drive the Holy Spirit out of the Bible. To this end they look at the prophets and wise men, who foresaw, by studying the signs of the times whither things were drifting, as shrewd statesmen may foresee a coming war long before the common people think of it. But no human being can, by his natural powers, foresee particular events such as marriages, deaths, the erection of heathen images at a certain place, and the like, that are to happen 400 years later. *Hinc illae lacrimae* about Daniel! To the Christian the entire talk of these particular, these exact predictions, which, by the way, are also found in other portions of the Bible to some extent, if not altogether in such numbers, seems ridiculous. That is the very God in whom we believe; if He could not foretell particulars of coming events; if His prophets had made any mistake in their predictions, He could not be God.

We have thus touched upon the main negative criticisms of Daniel; the defence is not as difficult as wavering Christians sometimes fear. Daniel, like all the books of the Bible, will never fall before the rationalism of men. But Christians, like good soldiers, need not remain on the defensive all the time. Glorious chances for the offensive are

offered by this very book of Daniel which has been ridiculed so much. We Christians live by faith, and not by sight. The plain fulfillment of ancient prophecies strengthens our faith, but the Holy Spirit creates and preserves it by the means of grace, the Word and the Sacraments, even though we could not point to a single prophecy that has been fulfilled. Even Christ's miracles were but outward means of revealing His divinity and drawing His disciples to Him. The sight of these wonderful works did not force any man to believe in Him, as the scribes and Pharisees bear witness. But the fulfillment of Bible prophecies cheers the heart of the Christians and silences the mouth of their foes. The fulfillment of Daniel's predictions is such cheering evidence of divine inspiration. All the rationalistic arguments that try to prove his prophecies *vaticina ex eventu* are futile. Nay, a closer view will convince us that Daniel's book must have been written several hundred years before Antiochus Epiphanes. Zachariah and Ezra already make use of Daniel's writings, though being 300 years before the times of the Maccabees. And what poor spiritual discernment do the critics display that believe Daniel's book to be written for the purpose of arousing the Jews of Maccabee times to desperate mortal combat. Not to speak of the absurdity of exhorting soldiers to defiance with long, calm, contemplative visions; could a patriotic contemporary of Judas Maccabee have described heathen rulers in the spirit of Daniel? The position of Nebuchadnezzar and Darius, and even of Belshazzar is radically different from the tendency of Antiochus to exterminate Judaism and the Mosaic religion. The Babylonian kings are heathens, it is true, who sometimes became cruel and overbearing against the Jews, holding the opinion common to all heathens that Israel's God was inferior to their own. But whenever the power of Jehovah is revealed, they glorify His name. Antiochus on the contrary, continued in his mad raving against the Jewish religion till God's judgment slew him. A Jew of

Maccabee times, when the heathens were hated with a deadly hatred, could impossibly recount to his countrymen the many noble traits and pious impulses of the Babylonian rulers. The fact remains beyond contradiction, that David foretold the times of the Maccabees. Not a historical narrative is presented; the form of prophetic vision is nowhere lost. No names of kings are mentioned; the king of the North—Syria, and the king of the South—Egypt, alone are spoken of. But whatever is foretold, history tells of its fulfillment and our faith is greatly strengthened by the fact, while the unbelieving critics may continue to follow Porphyrius in their sorry task of proving an impossibility.

But Daniel offers good chances of entering the enemy's territory a little further, and, though we should become offensive to the liberal theologians, we will carry the offensive warfare beyond the times of Antiochus. Even granting all that is claimed by the "Higher critics" concerning the time of "Daniel's birth" (and we have seen that we have not the least cause for doing so); even granting for argument's sake that a shrewd imposter of Maccabee times committed this great pious fraud of palming his own work off as that of Daniel: the Spirit of God is still revealed in the book. Many prophecies of Daniel go far beyond the times of Antiochus, even beyond the times of Christ, and some of these great prophecies have been plainly fulfilled in the Christian era, as we shall try to prove from the dream of Nebuchadnezzar. We read Dan. 2, 1–5: "And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams, wherewith his spirit was troubled, and his sleep brake from him. Then the king commanded to call the magicians, and the astrologers, and the sorcerers, and the Chaldeans, for to show the king his dreams. So they came and stood before the king. And the king said unto them: I have dreamed a dream and my spirit was troubled to know the dream. Then spake the Chaldeans to the king in Syria, O king, live forever: tell thy servants the

dream and we will show the interpretation. The king answered and said to the Chaldeans, The thing is gone from me: if ye will not make known unto me the dream with the interpretation thereof, ye shall be cut in pieces and your houses shall be made a dung hill."—The office of the magicians, the astrologers and the sorcerers mentioned, is told by their very names; but who are the Chaldeans? We know that the country of Babylon is also called Chaldea; the language of the people is called Chaldaic to this day. The name "Chaldean" is not fully explained as yet, even as the origin of the people is obscure. That the country was originally inhabited by Shemites, is certain according to Genesis 10. Shem had five sons, Elam, Ashur, Arphaxad, Lud and Aram, after whom the countries around the Euphrates and Tigris were named.

Elam settled the country between the lower course of the rivers and the mountains of Iran; Ashur peopled Assyria, stretching from the northern course of the Tigris to the mountains of Iran; from Arphaxad the district of Arapaehetis, embracing the eastern portion of the Armenian highland, received its name; Lud, the ancestor of the Lydians, spread farther west into Asia Minor, while Aram's descendants spread from the middle course of the Tigris and Euphrates in the East with Syria in the West. Thus the Shemites, from whom Abraham sprung, and whose country he left when they became idolaters, inhabited the entire country from the Armenian mountains in the North to the Persian gulf in the South. Towards the South-west they were hedged in by the Hammites, especially the Canaanites in Phoenicia and Canaan; on the East the teeming tribes of the Japhethites, who are to this day the migratory element in the world, the fore-fathers of the Celts, the Germans, the Slaves in Europe, the Medes, Persians, Indians in Asia, from whom we all are descended, filled the high plateau of Iran. But how about the Chaldeans? Their name is not found among the Shemites, though Abraham's father already

left Ur of the Chaldees. The Greeks named a people living north of Arphaxad, near the Caspian sea, the Chaldeans, or Gordheans, or Korduches. These are, no doubt the forefathers of the present Kurds, these robbers of the Syrian desert that are often identified with the Shemitic Arabs, because their mode of life is similar, while in fact they are an entirely different people, speaking an Indo-Germanic or Iranian dialect. For this reason many believe the ancient Chaldeans to have been Aryans, descending from the mountains bordering on the Caspian sea into the land of Shinar and subjugating the Shemites dwelling there. This seems quite reasonable; but the Bible gives us another clue. Gen. 10, 8–10 we read: "And Cush—the son of Ham—begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord. . . . And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel." The invasion of the godless Hammite and his warriors fully explains the facts in the case, though not the name "Chaldees." This invasion probably drove the pious son of Shem, Ashur, out of the land of Shinar, as we read in the very next verse, Gen. 10, 11. "Out of that land went forth Ashur, and builded Nineveh." Nimrod's oppression may also have caused Terah, the father of Abraham, to leave Ur of the Chaldees and look for more congenial quarters. Now the name of Chaldeans applied to the entire people and to one class of the priestoood in particular, becomes plain. The successful warriors gave the name of their tribe to the whole country, while they themselves formed the highest caste of the people, the priesthood, the highest class of the priests or magi again assuming the honored name of Chaldeans. The subjugated people, the Shemitic aborigines in their turn gave their language to the new rulers, even as the Romans did to the conquering Germans in the fifth century; for what we now call Chaldaic, is a branch of the Shemitic stock. Perhaps the priest caste spoke their Hammitic or Japhethitic language even in Nebuchadnezzar's time. The special mention of the fact

that the Chaldeans spoke to Nebuchadnezzar in Syriac (Dan. 2, 4) seems to imply this. From this verse the Hebrew of the first chapter of David changes into Chaldaic or Syriac.

Reading the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, the question naturally arises, whether the king really had forgotten his dream or not. When he says in the fifth verse, "the thing is gone from me," the former assumption would seem to be the right one. Critics have seized upon this to prove that the whole story of the dream was a fraud. They say that such terrible punishment as Nebuchadnezzar threatened and partly executed for such a flimsy reason is altogether incredible, and becomes so all the more, when we consider that the king did not know his dream. We deny that there is anything incredible about the cruelty of Nebuchadnezzar, even if he had forgotten his dream. The pages of history are full of similar Satanic brutalities. Was, perhaps, Saul's butchering of the entire priesthood a whit better than Nebuchadnezzar's cruelty? The very form of the punishment of the priests, to cut their bodies to pieces and turn their houses into dunghills, proves the truth of the story. As we now know, these cruel punishments were peculiarly Babylonian, and a Jew of Maccabee times, when general history was little known and the Babylonian empire had been overthrown for 400 years, can hardly be supposed to have possessed such accurate knowledge of Babylonian customs that had died out so long ago.

But it is not by any means certain that Nebuchadezzar had really forgotten his dream. It would exactly suit such a character as his to try his priests for once. They pretended to be in communication with the deity. If this pretense was true, there was nothing strange about Nebuchadnezzar's refusal to tell him the dream. Their constant claim of divine enlightenment was simply brought home to them in such a manner that none of their usual subterfuges and tricks would avail. On Carmel the prophet of God put

the priests of Baal to the test, and, of course, they were utterly routed; here the heathen king tries his own priests in a similar manner, and they do not even dare to call upon Bel for such a monstrous thing as the telling of a dream. They try to gain time; try to coax the secret out of the king, but must hear the stern rejoinder, Dan. 2, 8-9: "I know of certainty that ye would gain time, because ye see the thing is gone from me. But if ye will not make known unto me the dream, there is but one decree for you: for ye have prepared lying and corrupt words to speak before me, till the time be changed; therefore tell me the dream, *and I shall know that ye can shew me the interpretation thereof.*" It seems to us that Nebuchadnezzar could hardly have spoken in such a positive manner if the dream had entirely vanished from his mind. If the Chaldeans and the other priests had been certain of this, they would, probably, have made bold to invent some fantastic dream, rather than suffer certain death. The turn of Nebuchadnezzar's reply: "Tell me the dream and I *shall know* that ye can shew me the interpretation thereof," seems to imply his knowledge of the dream. He had been so greatly agitated by this wonderful dream, which had come to him, when, lying on his bed, he had thoughts of the times that were to come, that he was exceedingly anxious to learn the interpretation thereof. To this end he thus intended to test the wisdom of his wise men.

They were tried and found wanting. Dan. 2, 12. 13, we read: "For this cause the king was angry and very furious, and commanded to destroy all the wise men of Babylon. And the decree went forth that the wise men should be slain: and they sought Daniel and his fellows to be slain." Daniel and his friends belonged to the caste of the wise men, as they are called with a common term, and we need not be surprised that they also were doomed by the king's decree. But Daniel, hearing of the cruel decree and its cause from Arioch, the captain of the king's guard,

boldly went in, and desired of the king that he would give him time and that he would show the king the interpretation. Daniel had the faith that removes mountains. God had rewarded this fidelity and faith before; God did not forsake him now, for not only the lives of His servants, but His own glory was at stake. Like a true child of God Daniel firmly believed in the efficacy of prayer. He went home, told his friends of this matter and asked them to join him in prayer. During the night God revealed the dream unto him. And then he poured forth his soul in fervent praise and thanksgiving, which bears evidence alike of his great wisdom and humble piety. Then he went to the king. In the first place, he reminded him that the astrologers, the magicians, the soothsayers could never tell the dream unto the king, thus boldly denouncing the gods of the king himself as idols. Then he, as humble as Joseph had been in a similar position, proceeded thus: "But as for me, this secret is not revealed to me for any wisdom that I have more than any living, but for their sakes that shall make known the interpretation to the king and that thou mightest know the thought of thy heart." And in the 28th verse he says: "But there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days." And now he unfolds the wonderful dream of the great image with a head of fine gold, arms and breast of silver, belly and thighs of brass, legs of iron and feet half of iron, half of clay. "Thou sawest till a stone was cut out without hands which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. This is the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king. Thou, O king, art a king

of kings; for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of heaven hath He given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art the head of gold. And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things: and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise. And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay. And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."

Here we behold, in accurate outlines, the Chaldaic, the Medo-Persian, the Greek, and the Roman Empire. The Pagan world, when it left the one true God, was not left entirely by God. He permitted them to go their way; His revelation was given to but one people. Calvinists may cite this as proof of their absolute predestination. That would solve the whole difficulty. But Lutherans cannot solve this Gordian knot with the Calvinistic sword. The difficulty, which is found in the fact that all nations of the earth but one, were left to themselves, without the Word of God, will always confront us. But it does not confound us, by any means. We know that God's ways must be the best,

whether with individuals or nations. And by a careful study of history the veil is often withdrawn a little and we behold divine wisdom where, at first sight, we saw nothing but darkness and confusion. Soon after the flood, the evil heart of man forgot the terrible lesson it had received and began, in pantheistic pride, to worship nature and self instead of the Creator. Even Abraham's family was already infected with the abomination. And nothing remained for God to do but to take that one family and make His covenant with it. The heathen nations, that absolutely refused to follow him, were not forced to do so, as force is never employed by God in religious matters; but they were left to themselves for a time to try their own boasted powers and see how far they would come without God. They did employ their natural gifts. With arts and sciences they tried to cheer their lives, and in this respect they are our teachers to this day. Furthermore, in the centuries following king David who had raised the people of God to its highest earthly glory, the heathen nations were in great commotion. The grand idea of a universal empire on earth took hold of the nations, one after another. First, the Egyptians tried to conquer the world; Assyria, with its mighty warrior kings, followed, only to be succeeded by Babylon, Persia, Greece and Rome. All these monarchies came into hostile contact with the people of God. It almost seems as though this violent desire for universal conquest that filled kings and nations at that time, were an open defiance of the one God. It was, no doubt, a similar idea as the building of the tower of Babel. Otherwise the fact that no great nation of antiquity could endure the sight of another powerful nation, however remote it might be from its boundaries, would seem inexplicable. Egypt and the powers of western Asia, though no opposing commercial or national interests set them at sword's point, as is the case with the European powers of to-day, carried on the bloodiest wars for centuries. Darius had to reach over into European Scythia and Greece for no

apparent reason but the desire of a universal rule. Alexander stormed forward till even his iron-hearted Macedonians refused to follow any further; and Rome conquered all the powers that could possibly be reached, till the Parthians in the East and the Germans in the North proved too much for even this iron empire. The ladder of glory and power was climbed to the top by the heathen nations. But when the golden head was broken by the silver breast; when the brazen belly had devoured arms and breast and had, in its turn, been trodden down by the iron legs and feet, what was the outcome? Moral and religious bankruptcy. The prodigal son of the heathen nations had gone his own way and sunk into the lowest moral depravity. Millions of souls, having lost faith in their idols, were hungering for spiritual food, longing for a Redeemer, who came when the time was fulfilled. Believing itself entirely free from God's guidance, paganism had still prepared the way for the kingdom of God, that stone cut out of the mountain without hands, that became a mountain itself, after the overthrow of the last universal empire, the Roman monarchy. Even in its mad craving for universal conquest, paganism had to pave the way for the feet of the messengers of peace and salvation. Nor were the heathen nations entirely without a knowledge of God. Israel served as a light in the universal darkness, and no Israelite did more to make the heathen nations know and fear God than the prophet Daniel. There he stands before the mightiest man of his time, the representative of the heathen world, and tells him about the future of the world. He tells him that all the might of heathendom must eventually sink down beneath the kingdom of Jehovah, and soon Nebuchadnezzar is lying on his face, worshiping the God of Israel. WM. SCHMIDT.

THE RELIGION OF SECRET SOCIETIES.

(CONTINUED.)*

Religious fanaticism cannot have any place in a freemason's lodge, for the members of every sect of the Christian Church have an equal right in the order. *Oliver, Dict,* p. 508.

A Jew, a Mohammedan, or a Pagan may attend our lodge without fear of having his peculiar doctrines or mode of faith called in question by a comparison with others, which are repugnant to his creed. *Macay, Clyd.,* p. 497.

The Christian, Jew, Mohammedan in all their numberless sects and divisions . . . . combine with the Buddhist, the Parsee, the Confucian, the worshiper of the Diety under any form. *Morris, Pract. Syn.* p. 284.

The wandering Arab, the civil Chinese and the native American, the rigid observer of Masonic Law, the followers of Mohammed and the professors of Christianity are all connected by the mystic union. *Dalcho's Orat.* 17 *in Freem. by M.*

Arabs and Chinese, Savages and Jew, Mohammedans and Christians "are all cemented by the Mystic union . . . How infinitely pleasing must it be to him who is seated on the throne of mercy." *Ibid,* p. 159.

The descendants of Abraham, the diverse followers of Jesus, the Pariahs of the stricter sects here gather around the same altar, as one family manifesting no difference of creed or worship, and discord and contention are forgotten in works of humanity and peace. *Grosh. Man.* p. 277.

The stern laws of freemasonry level all distinctions of religion as well as rank and hail the Arab, the Mohammedan and the Tartar as brethren of the same devotional family

---

*In the continuation by the "*Zeitschrift*" of Dr. G. Fritschel's excerpts from Lodge literature, a great many from English sources are given in German translation. Since a retranslation would make them unavailable, translated extracts are omitted. C. H. L. S.

with the Christian and the Jew. *Ahiman Rezon, in Freem. by M. M.*, p. 230.

We should overlook all differences of minor nature which may divide us from our brethren, and cordially unite with the virtuous *irrespective* of country, *religion*, or politics. *Ritual*, p. 197. *Rev. O. F.*

Masonry aims at a unity with that holy institution (revealed religion) in all that is essential to the salvation of the immortal soul. *Masonic Adv.*, p. 19.

The principles of Freemasons have the same co-eternal and unshaken foundation, contain and inculcate the same truths in substance, and propose the same ultimate end as Christianity. *Town, in Finney*, p. 200.

Its ethics are the ethics of Christianity. *Mackey, Lex.* p. 159.

To be truly Masonic in every sense of the word is to be truly religious in motive and action. *Mackey, Mystic Tie*, p. 35.

Every good Mason is of necessity truly and emphatically a Christian. *Town* p. 37.

We do not recognize them (i. e. Templar Masons) as any part of real Masonry. . . . The Templar degree preposterously following a Hebrew one is a Christian one, an order of knighthood and not part of Masonry. *Grand Command'y, Knights Templar*, p. 75.

What regeneration by the Word of Truth is in religion, initiation is in Oddfellowship. *Grosh. Man.* p. 90; in *O. F. ill.* p. 35.

The lodge is enlightened by the presence of the revealed Will, and hence the Bible, as it is of all lights the most pure, is to the Mason most indispensable. *Mackey, Lex.* p. 281.

The Bible is therefore placed among our emblems, because it is the fountain whence we draw instruction. *Grosh. Man.* p. 181.

We enjoin others to take it (the Bible) as the rule and guide of our conduct. *Chase, Dig.* p. 209.

The Bible is moreover described in lectures, etc. as "the rule of faith," "the inestimable gift of God," "the vertex of the circle." *Morris, Pract. Syn.* p. 284.

From this pure fountain Masons draw their lessons of morality (p. 19); our ritual is drawn from the Bible and therefore must stand approved by all good men (p. 20.) *Mas. Advocate.*

The book of Law furnishes the key to its mysteries, for without it many matters purely masonic would remain an impenetrable mystery. *Pierson, Trad.*

In Oddf. most of our emblems are found in its (the Bible's) pages. (*Grosh. Man.* p. 161); the storehouse from which all our principles are derived. *Ritual, O. F. ill.*, p. 135.

Without the Bible there is no Masonry. *Chase, Digest.* p. 309.

No lodge can be held without it (i. e. the Bible). *Grosh. Man.* p. 161.

It (the Bible) is an integral part of Oddfellowship, and it is necessary that it should be present in every encampment while open for business. *Rev. O. F. ill.*, p. 158.

The Bible is found in every lodge as the highest and most holy emblem of freemasonry — — — and side by side with this first emblem there are found two other emblems of equal worth and dignity (**ebenbürtige**): the square and the circle. (And, like the latter) the Bible has but a symbolic, an emblematical significance (**Anſehen**). *Handbuch der Freim.* I. p. 106 and 7.

To the Mason the Bible is not, as it is to the Church, a book of religion (**Religionsbuch**), but a symbol of faith and of religious conviction. **In Ketteler, Freiheit, Autor und Ke,** 501. —*Nielson*, p. 52.

As matters now stand, the presence of the Bible on our altars is a matter of mere form. We do not hesitate to de-

clare that in our assembly it is out of place once and for ever, since the teachings of humanity occupy the most prominent place, and are taught as the best method to alleviate the condition of mankind. Schaik, im Holländ. Freim. Kalender of 1872, in *Secret Warfare* p. 58.

Another emblem (in place of the Bible) might have been chosen just as well. The Mohammedan might choose the Koran, and the Israelite the Old Testament Scriptures alone; but inasmuch as the Bible is a mere emblem, both Mohammedan and Israelite can unite in adoring the Bible, Old and New Testament, as a masonic sanctuary. Handb. der Freim. p. 107.

Will you allow yourselves to be put to shame by your Mohammedan brethren, who have lying on their altars not the Koran, but the Bible? * * * * (He is no Mason who) would reprove you for words used from the Koran, from Sophocles and Gœthe in order that you may worship God in spirit and in truth—for all Scripture (also the Koran, Sophocles, Gœthe, etc., etc.,) are given by inspiration of God and are profitable, &c. Bible is where God is. But where God is, who is able to judge? *Marbach*, Katechismusreden; in Ketteler Freih., Rut. und Kr.

Among the decrees of the Grand Lodge of Georgia there is found a resolution forbidding any member to offend Jews, Mohammedans, and Deists by praying in the name of Jesus Christ. Minutes of Grand Lodge of Georgia, 1866, p. 248, in *Spectator*, p. 14.

When Scripture passages are read, they are corrupted by what Macky calls "slight, but necessary modifications." E. g. When 1 Pet. 2, 5 is recited, the words "through Jesus Christ" are omitted. (Mackey's Ritual.)

Similarly—in the Royal Arch Degree—references to Christ are stricken in the use of 2 Thess. 3, 6–16.

Christ appeared as the philosopher and teacher of a pure natural religion. To secure its introduction among the Jews, He for the time being allowed many things to pass; in public

instruction that was entirely proper. But in His secret instructions and within His lodge, He showed to already prepared apostles and disciples the true light. In these lodges (Meiſterlogen), to give you but one hint, Jesus never put Himself forward as the true and real God, but only as the Grand Master of (or in) the Orient, who desired to illuminate men, to propagate pure moral conceptions and to assure men of immortality. Nielson, Freim. u. Chriſtenth., p. 88.

REDEMPTION AFTER DEATH.

In the December number of *The Magazine of Christian Literature*, the learned Dr. Briggs of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, published an article on the above subject, that filled me with profound astonishment. When I had read said article, I laid the Magazine aside, exclaiming in the words of Festus—but I trust with greater truthfulness—: Briggs, thou art beside thyself; much learning doth make thee mad.

It is not at all my intention to cross swords with this mighty champion of Modern Theology; I rather would humbly ask some questions.

1. The first question clamoring for an answer is this: *How can the assertion be proved, that a judgment at death has no warrant in the Scriptures?* Modern Theology, advocating the hypothesis of Redemption after Death, and that 'the intermediate state is for all believers without exception a state for their sanctification, where they are trained and prepared for the Christian perfection which they must attain ere the judgment day,' has no room and no use for a judgment at death. Hence that doctrine is denied. In the article referred to, it is stigmatized as heathenish, and without warrant in the Scriptures or in the creeds of Christendom. That is a sweeping assertion. But before we can be asked

to believe it, we demand proofs. The burden of proof is upon those who endeavor to supplant old and accepted doctrines by new theories.

We are told that many passages of Scripture are applied to judgment at death, which belong only to the day of final judgment. Therefore we desist from quoting passages of Holy Writ for that purpose, and rather ask questions concerning passages that might be quoted, and that have been quoted to substantiate the doctrine of a judgment at death.

When we read Hebrews 9, 27: "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment," does that really mean to say that it is appointed unto men once to die, and then for some thousand years to enter into the intermediate state for the purpose of exercising in sanctification, and finally, at the end of the world to have judgment pronounced upon them, whether they are saved or lost? If all this is to be found in those few and simple words, could God blame men, who do not possess such vigorous minds as the champions of Modern Theology, if they did not understand them in that way? Would it not be more natural, more in accordance with common sense and exegetical principles, to understand by "the judgment" in the above passage the judgment at death rather than the judgment at the end of the world?

Again, when we read Revelation 2, 10: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life," does this passage not seem to say, that God will give a crown to a Christian as soon as he has proved himself faithful unto death? If so, will it not be necessary for God to pass judgment at the death of a Christian, whether he has been faithful unto death or not? Whether the promised crown should be given or withheld? Does this passage not seem to favor and imply the doctrine of a judgment at death?

In this connection I desire to call attention to still another passage. It is affirmed that there is no judgment at death. When the Christian dies, he is not fit to enter

heaven, therefore he must enter the Intermediate State—the state for his sanctification. Here he must prepare himself for the Christian perfection, which he must attain ere the judgment day. Now when that judgment day shall finally be at hand, according to what rule or principle will judgment be passed upon him? If the foregoing means anything at all, I should think that now judgment ought to be passed upon that individual, whether in his Intermediate State he truly prepared himself for the Christian perfection which he must attain ere the judgment day. Hence the main issue, the gist of the final judgment, appears to be not as to whether man has made a salutary use of his time of grace here on earth, but whether he has perfected himself in the Intermediate State. Now we implore all the gigantic minds of Modern Theology to aid us in harmonizing the teachings of the Bible with such an assumption. 2 Cor. 5, 10., we read: "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done *in his body*, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." Would this passage not better harmonize with Modern Theology, if St. Paul had stated: We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done *out of his body* — whether in his Intermediate State he perfected himself or not? St. Paul seems to know nothing of such an Intermediate State; at least, that state of sanctification and preparation for Christian perfection seems to have no weight and decisive influence at all upon the result of the final judgment. Man shall be judged according to what he has done in his body. That is all that is said. And it would appear from this, that, even if there were no judgment at death, the judgment at the end of the world would vary in nothing, as far as the fate of the individual is concerned, from what it would have been at his death.—

2. Another question challenges our earnest consideration. *If in the Intermediate State we must first acquire a per-*

fect sanctification before we can enter heaven, what, then, does the righteousness and atoning death of Christ amount to? What becomes of the doctrine of justification by faith? Must we not infer from such a position, that the righteousness of Christ appropriated by faith does not and can not save us, but, at best, can only open to us the gates of the Intermediate State? Must we not open the gates of heaven ourselves, by preparing ourselves in the Intermediate State for the Christian perfection; or, in other words, by works of righteousness which we have done? But how does that harmonize with Titus 3, 5: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Again, in the eighth chapter of the Apocalypse St. John tells us of a great throng of saints, standing before the throne of God, clothed with white robes and palms in their hands. How did they enter that blessed abode? By acquiring a Christian perfection in the Intermediate State? I believe not. Was it not, because they had washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb? Is this doctrine of the Intermediate State not again the old heresy of salvation by self-righteousness and work-righteousness, with the exception of changing the scene from the regions of the earth to the regions of a supposed Intermediate State? We fail to see the great gain, boasted of by Modern Protestantism, by this their theory over the Romish doctrine of Purgatory. To us they seem essentially the same. Romanism wants to purge away the remaining sins in Purgatory; Protestantism wants to acquire perfection in the Intermediate State. These are merely negative and positive sides of the same thing; for the absence of perfection is sin as well as the presence of transgression.

3. At the risk of being impertinent, I cannot refrain from asking further: *How can the New Theology prove that men (believers) have better chances and better inclinations to per-*

fect themselves in sanctification in the Intermediate State than here on earth in the Church of Christ? It may be answered, that in the Intermediate State a person is no longer hampered by his sinful flesh, but that there he lives purely as a spirit. True, but that proves nothing. The body is certainly not the sinning element in man. A corpse commits no sin.

Finaliy I ask: *If "The Intermediate State is for all believers without exception a state for their sanctification", what will become of those believers who can impossibly enter that state?* He that proves too much, proves nothing. Romanism and Modern Protestantism are with each other in ridiculing the old orthodox doctrine that believers, who fall asleep in Jesus, are immediately sanctified and glorified, as "an immediate magical transformation at death, by which sin mechanically and violently falls off from us with the body." Call it that, if you please, but beware lest your doctrine fall into the same "magical transformation". We refrain from calling attention to our Lord's Narrative of the rich man and poor Lazarus. Too many other questions might challenge our consideration in that connection. But when the bleeding, suffering Savior answered the criminal on the cross: "Verily, I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise", what, then, became of the Intermediate State? Or does Paradise in this connection stand for the Intermediate State? Then Christ also must have entered that state, for he told the malefactor: "To-day shalt thou be *with me* in Paradise". Did Jesus also have to be prepared for the Christian perfection in the Intermediate State? If he did not enter that state, neither did the malefactor, for he went with Christ into Paradise.

If now it is answered that here we have an extraordinary case, and an exception to the rule, must it, nevertheless, not be admitted that, in this case at least, a believer did not enter "The intermediate state which is for *all believers without exception* a state for their sanctification?" Does it not appear as though the impossible were possible, that an "immediate

magical transformation at death, by which sin mechanically and violently falls off from us with the body," really and actually took place?

But God has given us still another revelation in His Word, which would seem to be somewhat perplexing to the theory of Modern Theology. St. Paul tells us: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." 1 Cor. 15, 51. 52. Thousands of believers will still be living here on earth when the Lord shall inaugurate the final judgment of the world. According to the theory advanced in the article to which I have repeatedly referred, the intermediate state will last only until the final judgment day. Hence the question arises again: If "the intermediate state is for all believers without exception a state for their sanctification, where they are trained in the school of Christ, and are prepared for the Christian perfection which they must attain ere the judgment day," what will become of all those believers who will live on earth until the judgment day, and after the intermediate state has been abolished? Will they be lost because they were unable in the intermediate state to prepare themselves for the Christian perfection which must be attained ere the judgment day? Will an immediate magical transformation take place with them? Or will there be a final judgment after the final judgment? Which shall it be?

E. H. D. WINTERHOFF.

THE SEMITIC DIALECTS.

The extensively and intensively growing interest in the study of Hebrew augurs well for the future of Biblical science in America. Not the least important feature in this matter is the fact that the cognate languages are engaging the earnest attention of all who would go beyond the merely mechanical acquisition of the Old Testament dialect

and be able to make independent research in its philology and exegesis. In nearly all of our leading seminaries, at least one of the sister tongues of the Hebrew is pursued, sometimes several; in the various summer schools of the American Institute of Hebrew, instruction is offered in all the leading Semitic dialects; dozens of bright graduates of American seminaries are sitting at the feet of leading Semitic scholars of Germany and England; while such of our leading institutions as Harvard, Yale and Johns Hopkins offer a course in these branches almost as wide and deep as that found at foreign universities. While the day may yet be distant when the study of these languages will be relieved of its hand-maid purpose for Hebrew, and they will be pursued for their own sake and with a purely philological aim, nevertheless a good work is being accomplished and theological science is and will be the gainer.

The old division of the Semitic languages into three groups, namely, the Northern, or Chaldee; the Middle, or Hebrew; and the Southern, or Arabic, has been generally and rightly discarded as without a good geographical or philological basis. Scholars are virtually agreed that there are but two groups, namely, the Northern and the Southern, however much investigation may differ as to the character of the proto-Semitic language or the original home of the people that spoke it. The Hebrew being a member of the Northern group, a student who is acquainted with Hebrew can probably find no better method of entering upon the field of Semitic dialects than through that tongue which geographically and historically has the closest connection with the Hebrew. We refer here to the Biblical and Targumic Aramaic, formerly incorrectly called Chaldean. In it are written Ezra 4, 8–6, 18; 7, 12–26; Dan. 2, 4–7, 28, and, with some slight modifications, the Targumic Onkelos and of Jonathan. The deviation from the Hebrew is so slight, that a comparatively short time will suffice to familiarize

ones self with the peculiarities of this dialect. It differs from the Hebrew chiefly in the hardening of certain consonants and the paucity of vowels. The best grammar on Biblical Aramaic is the recently published exhaustive treatise of Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Bibl. Aramaeisch*, 1884, and probably the best lexicon that of Levy, *Chaldaeisches Woerterbuch ueber die Targumin.* This contains some excellent additions by Professor Fleischer of Leipzig. For nearly three centuries the standard lexicon was that of Buxtorf, *Lexicon Chaldiaecum*, and is yet a rich treasure for the student. The new addition of this lexicon by Fischer, who published also a new edition of Winer's Chaldee grammar, can scarcely be called an improvement, except that it is not so unwieldy as is the bulky Buxtorf. A handy manual is that of Professor Charles Brown, of Newton Centre, Mass., called "Aramaic Method," of which the first part, containing on opposite pages, in Hebrew and Aramaic, selections from the Old Testament, as also all the necessary paradigms and a vocabulary.

The next step would naturally be toward the East Aramaic or Syriac, of which several sub-dialectics have been preserved. In character it is essentially the same as the West Aramaic. The beginner usually finds the greatest difficulty in acquiring the two alphabets used, the Jacobite or Nestorian and the Estrangelo. Dr. Eberhard Nestle has published a concise compendium of this dialect in one of the series of short Oriental grammars, published in Berlin by Professor Strack, called *Porta Linguarum Orientalium* and commenced by the late Professor Petermann. Nestle's grammar is entitled *Brevis Lurguse Syriacae grammatica, Litteratura, Chrestomathia cum glossario.* 1887. A larger and more systematic grammar is that of the prince of Semitic scholars, Professor Noeldecke, of Strassburg, *Syrische Grammatik.* 1880. The best chrestomathics are those of Roediger and Kirsch, both of which have lexicons. Of larger lexicons we have those of Castellus and Payne Smith. The chief literature

in this dialect is, of course, the Pesschito and the works of Ephraim and Bar-Hebraens.

The importance of the Assyrian language for Hebrew and Semitic philology is now a recognized matter, however much opinions may yet differ as to its *relative* importance. Professor Lyon, in the recent Harvard circular, remarks that it is well nigh indispensable for those who intend to teach the Semitic languages. In grammar it is very similar to the Hebrew and Syriac, and so far its contributions in this department have been chiefly illustrative and confirmatory. But in Hebrew lexicology and etymology Assyrian research has done great things. Semitic scholars are yet divided as to whether the Assyrian is to take the place in this work that Arabic has occupied without dispute, for over a century, but such works as that of Fred. Delitzsch on Assyrian and the Hebrew Lexicon fully establish the claim for Assyrian to speak a decisive word in the Etymology and definition of Semitic words. In late years Professor Delitzsch's *Lesestuecke* has been the principal text book in this department; the third edition of this work and Professor Lyon's "Assyrian Manual" probably share this honor together.

Of the other extra-Hebrew dialects of the Northern group, such as the Phoenician, the Moabitic, not enough has been preserved to make their independent study a matter of much importance, except possibly that of the Samaritan, of which a translation of the Pentateuch and a large number of liturgies have been preserved. Dr. Petermann has published a grammar of this language in his *Porta* series, and Dr. M. Heidenheim is just now issuing his *Bibliotheca Samaritana*, but in Hebrew letters.

As a group the South Semitic languages differ from their northern sisters chiefly in having a larger number of consonant and of grammatical forms and in greater lexicographical fulness. The richest of this group, and in fact of the whole Semitic family, is the Arabic, the language of the

Koran. Although it did not become a literary language until about the sixth century after Christ, yet it has preserved the proto-Semitic type in its purity better than any of its sisters. Oriental conservatism has here done philological science a great service. The great value of the Arabic consists in this, that it has worked out consistently in grammar and in lexicon those peculiarities and distinguishing features of the Semitic family of languages which we find undeveloped and in an embryonic shape in the other dialects. A rational and philological Semitic grammar must ever be based on the Arabic, and without a knowledge of this language it is simply impossible to have much more than a mechanical knowledge of the Hebrew. The thesis of Ewald that the Hebrew should form the starting point for a grammatical system of a Semitic language, was met by the antithesis of Oldshausen, that the Arabic should constitute such a basis. As far as Semitic grammar is concerned, the scholarship seems to be virtually agreed with Oldshausen, either entirely or in the modified form of a synthesis as presented in Stade's *Heb. Grammatik.* The outcome of the discussions in recent years on this point seems to be this, that so far as grammar is concerned Arabic will continue to occupy the leading position, while in lexicography it must at least consent to share the honor with Assyriology.

The facilities for studying Arabic are better than for any other Semitic tongue besides the Hebrew. The old grammar in Petermann's series is now antiquated, but we have now an entirely revised edition of this grammar, in Latin and English, by Professor A. Socin, of Leipzig. This work is from the best hand compendium for those who desire to become acquainted with the mysteries of the Arabic. The best grammar of this language is the work of Professor W. Wright, "A Grammar of the Arabic Language," 1874, in two volumes, which are based upon the German of Caspari, but by their exhaustive and scientific treatment have all the merit of an original work. Wright has also published

an Arabic Reading Book, and there are a number of Chrestomathies published by continental scholars, the best probably being that of Arnold. The most classical among Arabic works is the Koran, which is also the best which the student can take up after he has become acquainted with the leading peculiarities of the grammar. The leading lexicons have so far been Freytag's *Lexicon Arabico Latinum*, in two large volumes, and the well-known English Arabic Dictionary of Catafago. Within the past few months a new dictionary has appeared in England, published by Dr. Steingass, which for scientific method and research is an excellent advance upon its predecessors. The *Athanœum*, in its review of this work, expresses the opinion that it will sooner or later take the place of both Freytag and Catafago.

Last but not least on the list of leading Semitic dialects comes the Ethiopic. It is closely allied to the Arabic in grammar and lexicon, but is yet sufficiently distinct to be an entirely independent language in many features showing a remarkable similarity to the Hebrew and other Northern tongues. One of its most noteworthy features is its rich syntax. Under the influence of Greek and Coptic models, it has developed all the possibilities of the Semitic syntax, so that for fineness in construction it almost rivals the Greek. There are no aids for the study of Ethiopic in the English language. But the *Grammatik*, the *Chrestomathia* and the Lexicon of Professor Dillmann, of Berlin belong to the best works which Semitic study has ever produced. All are in their way exhaustive and complete. Since the death of Professor Trumpp, of Munich a few months ago, Professor Haupt, of Johns Hopkins, is probably next to Dillmann, the leading Ethiopic scholar of the day, and he has promised to publish, in the near future in the *Hebraica* a synopsis of the Ethiopic language. Praetorius has written for the Petermann series the long lacking Ethiopic grammar.

In conclusion it would probably be well to mention that the New Hebraic is now engaging the attention of many

scientific scholars, and that the recently published grammar of Strack and Siegfried, which is also one of the Petermann series but has as yet no Chrestomathy and lexicon, is a good summary of the peculiarities of this form of speech.

G. H. SCHODDE.

MISSIONARY DEPARTMENT.

IN CHARGE OF REV. E. PFEIFFER, A. M. OF DELAWARE, O.

THE CLAIM OF MISSIONS UPON THE PULPIT.*

That an enterprise, through which pulpits are erected in heathendom, has a certain claim upon the support of the ministry of Christendom, is indeed self-evident. If, in spite of this fact, there are still preachers who repudiate any such claim, this must be due to a misunderstanding. True, the word "Mission" is not infrequently used in such a narrow and distorted sense that, if this were its true signification, the representatives of the Church would be justified in ignoring it. But such use is simply a misuse, for which the work of missions is in no wise responsible. When *we* speak of missions, we do not mean this or that missionary society, nor even the entire body of those who propagate the Gospel in heathendom, neither do we refer to this or that party, movement or human arrangement,—all this is much too narrow, much too small—no, we mean *the work of God for the bringing about of obedience to the faith among all nations*, the apostleship entrusted to the whole Church of Christ, that which in the New Testament is designated *the work of the Lord* (1 Cor. 15, 58; Phil. 2, 30), or simply *the Gospel* (in the active sense, Rom. 1, 1; 15, 19; 1 Cor. 9, 14. 18; 2 Cor. 2, 12; Gal. 2, 7; Phil. 1, 12; 2, 22; 4, 3; 4, 15.) A church and pulpit that has ceased to preach the Gospel in this sense is in danger of losing the Gospel itself, or as Dr. Duff has said,

* Translated from "Die Mission auf der Kanzel," by J. Hesse.

a church that does not evangelize (i. e., missionate) will not long remain evangelical. In order to hold fast what we have, we must give what we have. Through teaching we learn; and it is more blessed to give than to receive.

Every living organism has two functions; one looking to self-preservation, and the other to self-extension or propagation. According to present usage that, under the influence of a state-churchdom, has come to place missions and the Church *side by side*, we understand by the Church for the most part only the sum of those functions and organs which belong to the self-preservation of the Church corporate.* Thus it was possible for the misconception to arise, as though missions were not necessarily and as a matter of course the business of the Church.

A pastor is not properly serving even his own little congregation, if he does not aim to develop within it a missionary Christianity. He is charged to teach the baptized all things whatsoever Christ has commanded His own, and to these commandments His missionary command certainly also belongs. There is not a congregation, nor a single soul indeed, that has not the duty as well as the privilege of co-operating in the execution of this command. How forcibly and impressively does the newer theology, as represented, for example, by a Beck or a Ritschl, declare that the entire conduct of all Christians must be regulated by *the idea of the kingdom of God*, that only those acts are moral which are done in the sense and spirit and interest of the kingdom of God. This can certainly mean nothing else than that every Christian should at all times so conduct himself that through his conduct the kingdom of God may be advanced, *that* kingdom, for the coming of which we continually pray, *that* kingdom, into which all the nations are to enter, and into which they cannot enter, unless we bring

* The author refers of course to relations that exist in Germany, but his remarks, we believe, will find at least a local application among us.— *Trans.*

it unto them, for God works through men. "I will make *you* fishers of men;" "*ye* shall be witnesses unto me;" "as my Father hath sent me, even so send I *you*:"—these are the words of Christ. And St. Paul calls himself and his fellow-laborers workers together with God, and the Church he calls a pillar and ground of the truth, i. e., a lofty column, from which the mystery of godliness shines far out into the world. We believe that we would not be transcending the limits of the truth if we would say that the measure of holiness for the individual Christian as well as for the congregation is found in the degree of their missionary energy (Missionstuechtigkeit) with respect to the world. That those who are without may be won,—this is set forth, not only in the writings of St. Paul, but throughout the New Testament, as one of the principal motives to every Christian virtue. How then can a preacher be fulfilling his duty if he fails to direct the attention of his hearers to the motive unto holiness that is contained in their call to mission work * * *

And how is it possible to preach on Advent Sunday, or at Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension Day, Pentecost, and especially on Good Friday, how can the texts of these festivals be expounded exegetically, not to speak of their homiletic development, without calling attention to the heathen also as heirs together with us of the grace of life? We do not ask that any particular missionary society be recommended from the pulpit, or that the operations of modern missions be referred to in terms of approbation. But we do maintain that a pastor who never preaches on the great missionary thoughts of the Scriptures, who year in and year out maintains silence with regard to the missionary duty of the Church, who never forms a judgment with regard to the missionary enterprises that are at present carried on and leaves his hearers in the dark on the question whether they ought to engage in such work or not,—we hold that he is not doing his duty.

We would merely allude to the fact that missions have a claim upon the pulpit in another sense also, that, namely, the history of missions, even those of the present day,—think for instance, of the martyrs of Uganda, the marvelous revolution in Japan, &c.—is well worthy of being used for homiletical purposes, that many a sermon would be greatly improved by the narration of conversions and other incidents and illustrations from heathen and Jewish missions. We will not lure the representatives of the pulpit with the advantage which *they* might draw from the study of missions. Missions do not exist for the sake of the pulpit. Rather might it be said that the pulpit exists for the sake of missions. And experience teaches that where missions are regarded merely as a means of reviving the churches at home, or, what is worse still, only as a store-house of homiletic embellishments, the cause itself is, in spite of all the fair speeches, in no wise advanced; where, on the contrary, the cause has taken a foothold, where the Gospel is preached in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, the necessities of the heathen will not be forgotten.

What we wish in this place particularly to emphasize is the duty of the preacher to carry the cause of missions *into the pulpit* that is, before the entire congregation, and thus to aid in destroying the still prevalent and wide-spread error that it is the peculiar fancy or hobby of a few pious fanatics, a work of supererogation that has no necessary connection with ordinary Christianity and is accordingly carried on only in assemblies having the nature of conventicles. It is true, we are living in a missionary era; but it is yet only in its incipient stages. Not until the pulpit has given itself wholly to the service of the missionary idea, and there is no longer a believing pastor who deems it unsuitable at the principal service and in his sermon to direct attention to the heathen and to those who bring them the Gospel,—not until then will the true missionary age be upon us.

A FEW WORDS OF ENTREATY AND APPEAL.

The Missionary Department is sustained wholly in the interest of our Synod's welfare. It is not scientific, but entirely practical in its character and purpose. It will not therefore be deemed out of place, we trust, if we express a few thoughts on a very common-place and withal uninviting theme.

Brethren, I am not an alarmist, but I confess that I am alarmed about our Synod's future, or rather in view of the trend of its present operations. That we have made conspicuous progress during the last decade is evident to every observer. And the question of vital interest to every one of us at present is, whether we shall continue to move on toward ascendency, whether we shall continue to build on the basis of the advances made, or whether we are not already going backward, and whether the cry must not soon prevail: *Retrenchment!*

We have stretched out our arms bravely to the South-east and to the North-west, to the very borders of the Union. This action was not taken hastily, but deliberately, and after counting the cost. We have never heard a single regret expressed in view of it. Divine Providence opened the way, and we would have been recreant to our duty, had we refused to obey the clearly expressed will of our God. The providential signals to move on in the same direction, to enter new doors opening before us, to extend the outposts of our camp, have not ceased. The Great West especially presents a field vast in extent, rich in resources, great in possibilities. It opens doors to every possible belief and unbelief, to Church and sect, to truth and falsehood, to righteousness and wickedness, and every voice that can be distinguished above the din and clamor of clashing and conflicting interests and enterprises cry: Now *is your opportunity! What thou doest do quickly!*

What of it? Are *we* going in to possess the land? No prophet is needed to tell us that, unless our speed is considerably increased, and unless our force and methods of work are vastly improved, there will be very little ground for us to set foot on. What with the General Synod, its easy accommodation to circumstances, its large resources for Church Extension, its agents securing church sites and taking possession of strategic points in the growing cities, the General Council making rapid advances under the leadership of an able and energetic Missionary Superintendent* and improved missionary methods, the German Lutheran Synods of Missouri, Iowa, etc., numerously represented by traveling missionaries, and sectarians of every description whose zeal seems to be in proportion to the degree of their aberration from the truth,—with all these competitors in the field before us, there will be very little room for us ten or twenty years hence. If ever there was a time and a sphere of action where the injunction, "Redeeming the time," was urgent and imperative, it is the *Now* of the *Great West.*

And what are we doing to meet the issue? First of all, by our continued neglect to work up the Church Building Fund to respectable dimensions that might in the near future bear some proportion to the demands of a growing mission field, we are tying our hands, discouraging our missions and missionaries, and subjecting them to hampering and all but insurmountable difficulties in the struggle for life. And whilst we are guilty of irreparable folly in thus neglecting this most important cause of church extension, we are coming so far short of meeting the present meager demands of our limited home mission work that the Mission Board is in the greatest strait to know how it shall

* Take, for instance, the following bit of news, reported by the *Church Messenger:* "Students from the Seminary will be employed during the summer vacation by the Missionary Superintendent Passavant, to do mission work in the far West. We expect to be able to report good results from their labors."

discharge its present obligations. Then, when we turn our attention to the financial support of our Institutions, the outlook is worse still and even more discouraging. The unwelcome, bitter fact is staring us in the face, that another debt is accumulating at a rapid pace.* The treasurer reports a debt—*a debt*—of nearly $8000—and this so soon in the wake of the mighty and fairly successful effort to cancel the old debt—"*that debt,*" over which we sighed and under which we groaned and sweated and labored until it was finally paid. We fear that this will do more to retard our progress than all other hindrances combined. The fact that only a few of the charges of Joint Synod are paying their apportionment in full or with a surplus, and that all the rest—some of them large and wealthy charges—are sending in but a fraction—some a mere pittance of their quota,—this fact can hardly fail in time injuriously to affect, to discourage and dishearten the willing workers both among the pastors and the members of our churches. Certain it is that the General Treasury cannot continue at this rate very long without incurring disaster. To this must be added still another fact regarding our finances that thoughtful minds can hardly contemplate without apprehension and misgiving. The annual report of our Book Concern, rendered April last, showed that there were outstanding accounts aggregating the enormous sum of $10,000.† In other words, we are carrying a book account equal to one-third the assets of the Concern.

Where is the seat and root of the trouble? We know very well that there are not a few among the brethren who are ready to point out this and that fault, this and that mistake, as they think, in the management of our affairs, and to attribute our shortcomings largely or wholly to this cause. At one time fault is found with one or the other of our

---

*See *Lutheran Standard* of May 3.

†See *Lutheran Standard* of May 10.

Institutions; at another time the source of dissatisfaction is some action of one of our Boards; and anon indignation and wrath are lavished upon our business agent and what is regarded as the mismanagement of our Book Concern. Now we make bold to raise the question, whether it is the errors, real or imaginary, which are made or reported to have been made in some branch of our synodical operations upon which may justly be laid the blame for causing righteous complaint and dissatisfaction and consequent disaffection and lethargy among the brethren, or whether it is not rather the rash and hasty judgments, the inconsiderate remarks, the utterly unjustifiable fault-finding and condemnation indulged in by many of our pastors. We do not hesitate to express it as our opinion that the latter conduct lies at the tap-root of our most serious troubles. If such conduct were restricted to a few constitutional croakers who are known to find fault with everything, while they themselves do nothing to improve matters, the danger of injurious results would not be so great. But this spirit is contagious. And when it seizes upon those who have shown themselves able and willing to put their shoulder to the wheel and contribute materially to Synod's progress, when leading men in the various districts so far forget themselves as not only to heed these disparaging voices, but also to consent and contribute to them, the seeds of rebellion, dismemberment and destruction are scattered broadcast, and it is hard to tell where the mischief will end.

Now we do not pretend to imply that there is no cause at all for complaint, that no corrections and improvements are needed, and that no blunders are made. But we do plead, in the name of Christian virtue, for the sake of a Christ-like ministry, and in the interest of Synod, for more considerate treatment of the hard-working and disinterested boards or other representatives of Synod who make or are thought to make those blunders. It would be strange if no mistakes were made, if a board, for example, that has dealings with

various persons and is not equipped with the best facilities, were not sometimes deceived, led to take indiscreet and ill-advised action, and the like. Boards, like individuals, gradually acquire experience and not seldom have to learn by the blunders they make. There are orderly and Christian ways of applying correctives, and accounts should be required and rendered in due time. But what we protest and warn against are untimely judgments and harsh and oftimes unfounded censures that tend to embitter and dishearten those upon whom, in addition to their pastoral duties, the heavy burden of synodical labors is laid, to foster a spirit of discontent among the brethren at large, and needlessly and seriously to damage every synodical interest. We know, for example, that during the past year certain acts performed by Synod's representatives purely and wholly in the interest and to the advantage of Synod have, owing doubtless to the fact that those who judged them lacked an adequate knowledge of the whole case, been misconstrued, grossly misrepresented; and such reports have been spread, passed from lip to ear and augmented as they proceeded, in regular gossip style. Brethren, these things ought not so to be. If we have cause to warn our people against the sin and bane of gossip even in the common affairs of every day life, what plea can be offered in extenuation of their conduct, when the shepherds of the flock indulge in this nefarious work in the higher sphere of churchly and synodical interests? In God's name, and for the sake of our own souls and the souls whom we are charged to lead by precept and example, let us be more circumspect and more considerate. Let us repose a respectable amount of confidence in the honesty and earnestness of those who represent and serve us in multitudinous synodical labors, gratuitously rendered. Let us beware, lest, by our ingratitude and unkindness, we embitter the hearts and finally drive from their posts those who are rendering to Synod faithful and efficient service at no small expenditure of time and toil and self-denial. Let us

be fair enough to suspend judgment until the case is fairly laid before us, and to bide the time when full accounts will be rendered and when, if called for, strictures may be made and rebukes administered with salutary effect.

Something must be done, and done speedily, to prevent the General Treasury going further into debt and ultimate bankruptcy. The facts are too evident to need further elucidation. Shall we let matters go on at this rate and take their own course, or shall we make determined efforts to stem the current? We believe that it is within the power of the pastors of Joint Synod to interpose and save the day. Those who have hitherto fallen short of their quota must raise it as soon and as speedily as possible. Making every reasonable allowance for diversity of charges, circumstances, &c., the congregations that fail to raise the apportionment must become the exception and cease to be the rule, as it is at present. How can this be brought about?

We do not believe that our pastors are, as a rule, lacking in the earnest purpose to serve the Lord and His Church loyally and self-sacrificingly. But we do believe that there is among us a great lack of tact in organizing our forces and and of courage in working our resources. This then is what we need to study. Let us make it the theme of private reflection and of discussion in congregational and synodical meetings. Until orderly methods and systematic plans of work displace the hap-hazard and spasmodic efforts that prevail so largely now, much latent power and much hidden treasure in our congregations must remain undiscovered and unapplied.

LITERATURE.

DIE MISSION AUF DER KANZEL. Texte, Themata, Dispositionen und Quellennachweise fuer Missionsvortraege, von J. Hesse. Calw & Stuttgart, 1889. 324 pages, small octavo. Price: 90 cents.

There can be no question about the propriety and utility of imparting to our congregations missionary knowl-

edge in the broadest scope of the term. Many of us recognize a clear duty in this direction, if we would, in our day, make full proof of our ministry. But when the task comes fully before us, we begin to appreciate its difficulties. Our first attempts to hold missionary services reveal the inadequacy of our preparation and impress us as unsatisfactory. Instead of being encouraged to press on and continue the good work, we may be impelled to draw back and give it up.

We should consider at the outset that this is a comparatively new and unexplored field to us, and that good and reliable helps are indispensable to its proper cultivation. We need more than the Bible and Biblical Commentaries and theological outfit. We must have some missionary literature. Historical matter is indispensable. And if we can secure works that throw light upon the theory and practice of missionary addresses, that give us hints and directions in regard to the manner of working up the material to which we have access, so much the better.

The book before us is a work of this character. It contains the following chapters: 1. The Claim of Missions upon the pulpit, pp. 1–5; 2. The Annual Missionary Festival in the Church, pp. 6–10; 3. The Missionary Sermon, pp. 10–20; 4. The Missionary Service, pp. 21–31; 5. Skeletons for Missionary Addresses of all Kinds, pp. 32–166; 6. Prayers, pp. 166–198; 7. Striking Events from the History of Missions Corresponding to every Day of the Year, together with References to their Sources, pp. 199–324.

We have presented above a translation of the bulk of the first chapter. The second, third and fourth chapters offer valuable suggestions on the subjects treated. The fifth chapter contains a copious and varied selection of carefully prepared outlines on texts of the Old and New Testament. Every text is elucidated and illustrated by references to the history of missions, giving the books and magazines where the desired narratives or events may be found. The prayers of the sixth chapter are adapted to be used at the opening and close of missionary festivals and services. There are also special "prayers for Israel." The seventh chapter is a marvelous compilation of missionary facts and events, from three to nine corresponding to each day of the year, with complete references to the literature in which they are described. This part of the book is very valuable to one who understands how to use it and has a fair supply of missionary literature. Frequent reference is made, among others, to the Kleine Missions-Bibliothek of Burkhardt-Grundemann, Warneck's Missionsstunden, and the Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. X. AUGUST, 1890. No. 4.

THE DAWN OF THE REFORMATION.

The deplorable condition of affairs in the forepart of the sixteenth century was not a sudden apparition that fell upon Christendom without warning. It was rather an appearance whose shadow had been forecast for ages. It was the result of a gradual development of causes which had been in operation for centuries. There is reason to believe that even during the lifetime of the Apostles themselves Satan began sowing the seed which in due time brought forth such a harvest of tares. When Paul writes to the Thessalonians, 2. 7, "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work," he, no doubt, had reference to that hidden power of evil, which, although then working under cover, gradually threw off its mask until in the middle ages it appeared in all its hideousness as a very caricature of God's truth and a mockery of His holy church.

It is difficult for us at this late day to form an adequate conception of the spiritual devastation that had spread over Christendom during the centuries of papal tyranny. And it is a piece of jesuitic trickery when the Romish church of to-day endeavors to paint the spiritual condition of those times in brighter colors. The worst that has been said of those dark days before the Reformation is not the judgment of the enemies of Rome. Men of high standing in the

Romish church, scholars of undoubted learning and sterling worth, whose faithfulness to their church has never been doubted, have painted the social, political, moral, and spiritual depravity of those times in the deepest dyes. Erasmus declares: "In the church they do not think of explaining the Gospel. The greater part of their preaching must be delivered in a manner to suit the authorized agents of indulgence. The most sacred doctrine of Christ must, when it is to their advantage, be suppressed or perverted. There is no hope of a change for the better until Christ Himself shall convert the hearts of princes and priests, and incite them to seek true piety." (Hist. Ref. d'Aubigne'. Book I, chap. 8.) Speaking of the priests and monks he says: The greatest pleasure of these people is to tell fictitious tales of miracles or to hear them told, and to make special use of them to entertain the stupidity of others and fill their own purses. Again he tells of how every province has its own special saint, every affliction its saint, and every saint his taper; this one cures toothache, another assists women in confinement, a third restores stolen goods, a fourth delivers from shipwreck, a fifth protects the flocks. Some there are who possess several virtues at the same time, particularly the virgin mother of God, in whom the people trust more than in her Son. The more obscure and doubtful the character of the saint, as for instance St. George, St. Christopher, St. Barbara, the more fervent the adoration; such are placed above St. Peter or St. Paul or Christ Himself. With telling effect he directs the shafts of his scathing criticism against the papal court in these words: "Can there be greater enemies of the church than these unholy high priests, who by their silence consign Christ to obscurity, who by their avaricious decrees bind His hands, who by strained expositions pervert His doctrine, and by their offensive life crucify Him anew?"

Pope Hadrian VI, the successor of Leo X, under whose profligate reign the ecclesiastical abuses had reached their

climax immediately previous to Luther's appearance on the ecclesiastical arena, admitted before a council of German princes held in the city of Nuremberg, 1522, the corruption in ecclesiastical affairs in the following words: "We are aware of the fact that there have been for many years, in this holy seat, many grievous abuses in spiritual affairs, transgression of commandments, and that all things are perverted. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that the disease descended from the head to the members, from the pope to the lower prelates. We prelates and clergy every one went his own way. Nor has there for many years been one who did any good thing, no, not one. Therefore we must needs all give God the glory, and humble our souls. Let every one see from whence he has fallen and rather judge himself, than be judged of God by the rod of His wrath and anger. We will give all diligence that this Romish court, from whence probably all this evil had its origin, be reformed, in order that, as from here the evil and corruption flowed down to those below, so also health and reformation may proceed from the same source; and to this we feel ourselves all the more obligated, since the whole world seems anxious to receive such a reformation." (Seckendorf, Hist. Ref. Book 1. § 137."

Perhaps the boldest admission of the corruption of the Romish Church previous to the Reformation by her friends, is that of Cardinal Bellarmin (died 1621). In his day he was the greatest theologian of his church. He frankly admits: "A few years previous to the appearance of the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresies, according to the testimony of contemporaneous writers, there was no strictness in the spiritual courts, no discipline in regard to morals, no knowledge of sacred science, no reverence for spiritual affairs. There was scarcely any trace left of religion." (Guericke's Church Hist. III. 4.

But all this was only the legitimate outgrowth of a system of spiritual tyranny that had been exercised in the name of the religion of Him who Himself confessed that He

had not come into the world to be served, but to serve. Tyranny is detestable in all its forms, but it is never more so than when it assumes dominion over men's consciences. Not only was it necessary in order to dupe the masses and make them willing slaves to the whims of the ostensible successor of St. Peter, to weaken the authority of the Word, by teaching that the church alone in its official representatives was authorized to interpret and fix the meaning of Scripture, but the Word itself must be banished from among God's people. Luther, although brought up by pious parents, and in strict conformity with the requirements of the church, was twenty years old before he saw a complete copy of the Bible, and then it was in the Latin language, and only a special providence led him to find it in the university library at Erfurth.

When the Word of God, as the source of all truth in the sphere of morals and religion, was taken from God's people, it became comparatively an easy matter to introduce all manner of errors and to bring them under a yoke of bondage so galling, that the cries of the oppressed rose to heaven and called for vengeance. When the sun is eclipsed there must needs be darkness. And surely the words of the prophet are applicable to those days of papal supremacy: "For behold the darkness shall cover the earth and gross darkness the people." The question which above all others must concern every earnest soul: "What shall I do to be saved?" was wrapped in thick darkness. What seems to us now as light as the noonday sun, was then shrouded in the gloom of midnight. Anxious souls groped about in this Egyptian darkness without even a ray of hope. They were told to do good works, and to pray to the saints, and even when this had been done with all the earnestness with which a drowning man grabs at a straw, they were told that no one could ever be certain of his salvation, but must remain in perpetual doubt whether he has been accepted of God or not.

The climax of Romish tyranny and ecclesiastical abuse was reached in the sale of indulgence. The doctrine of indulgences as taught by the Romish Church is frequently misunderstood. According to Rome's teaching three things are necessary to obtain forgiveness of sins. First comes contrition. The sinner must experience sorrow for his transgressions. Secondly comes confession. The contrite sinner must repeat to the priest the sins which he desires forgiven. And lastly comes the penance. After the sins are verbally confessed the sinner must make satisfaction before he can be assured that his sins are really forgiven. This penance or satisfaction for sins has reference only to the temporal punishments which follow sin. No doubt it had its origin in the custom of the early church of demanding public confession and satisfactory evidence of true repentance on the part of those who asked to be reinstated into the fellowship of the church, after having lapsed into gross sin. Fasting, alms-giving, and finally also going on pilgrimages, were looked upon as such evidence. Gradually the giving of alms was the more favored mode of expressing repentance. The church of course undertook the distribution of these gifts to the poor.

The doctrine of purgatory is also inseparably connected with that of indulgence. In purgatory that part of the temporal punishment of sins which was not borne in this world, is completed. Now, it was but natural that men desired to secure themselves against a very long stay in this place of temporary punishment preparatory to entering heaven. And the church was magnanimous (?) enough to offer those who desired it a release from this, or at least an abbreviation of it. She told men that by doing good works, such as fasting, giving of alms, etc., in this world, they might shorten their stay in purgatory. The church then not only agreed to take charge of the distribution of alms, but even to furnish substitutes for those who did not feel like fasting or making pilgrimages. Men might do these good works by

proxy. And, since the saints had done many more such works than were necessary for themselves, it was the privilege of the church to dispose of these superfluous works. This she offered to do on condition that those who desired a share of this store of good works should pay for them in hard cash.

Now, although in theory the church offered only the remission of the temporal punishments of sin in the sale of indulgences, yet in practice it virtually amounted to selling the grace of God and a title to heaven for money. And under the indescribable ignorance and terrible anxiety of burdened consciences, this business got to be an inexhaustible mine of wealth. The profligate life of the clergy, the pomp and luxury of the papal and other pontifical courts, the lavish display of art in sculpture, painting and architecture, all required incalculable sums of money, and this doctrine of indulgences always proved to be the magician's wand by which funds were conjured up for the depleted treasuries of the church. The national wealth, especially of Germany, was thus drained. Thousands upon thousands in money were sent across the Alps, for which there were no returns except the mockery of the spiritual harlot who sat on her seven hills and trod the nations under the iron heel of her despotism. Yea, the very name of religion was disgraced by the hypocrisy, voluptuousness, and vice of those who claimed to be its highest representatives on earth. It was a very dark night whose pall hung over the nations upon whom the light of the Gospel had once shone. It was a long night too, and to many an anxious soul who longed for the light it may have seemed that it would never end.

Long ere the sun rises the first streaks of the morning light break across the eastern skies. The day which brought the glorious light of the Gospel did not burst upon the world in an instant. There was dawn after darkness, and at first it was so indistinct that it was hard to distinguish light from darkness; but even the first beams of the morning light are

the harbinger of a new day. Around the central figure of the great Luther monument at Worms, and sitting at his feet, are four figures which represent the four great forerunners of the Reformation: *Peter Waldes, John Wickliff, John Huss, and Geronimo Savanarola.*

The first of these lived in the city of Lyons in southern France about the latter half of the twelfth century. Filled with a desire for spiritual knowledge, he employed two priests to translate into his native tongue some of the more important passages of Scripture. These, together with the best commentaries then at hand, he committed to memory. Those passages in which Christ warns against the deceitfulness of riches seem to have particularly impressed him. The words which the Savior spoke to the rich young man, Matt. 19, 21: "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come and follow me," he interpreted literally and began to act accordingly. After he had disposed of his wealth for the relief of the poor, he went about in the villages and cities preaching. He soon found followers, for there were many souls who hungered after the truth but found no spiritual food in the public ministrations of the priesthood. His followers also began to preach, and even women arose to teach publicly. In the streets, in private houses, and even in the churches during the intervals of public service or after mass had been read, they took occasion to preach. Not long however could Rome endure such things. The archbishop of Lyons forbade their work. But Waldes and his followers, appealing to the words of the Savior, Acts 5, 29: "We ought to obey God rather than men," went on preaching the Gospel to the best of their knowledge and ability and were at length banished from the city. The matter was finally referred to a general council under Pope Alexander III. The Romish clergy admitted that if the Waldenses were allowed to go on with their work the clergy would be driven off. From the reports of the Romish writers

of that day they called themselves the poor in spirit or the humiliated, and went about in pairs barefoot, clothed in woolen garments as the garb of penitence. At length, in 1184, they were excommunicated as heretics, for up to this time they had no intention of separating from the Romish church. Persecution, as usual, only served to strengthen them in their faith, and before the end of the twelfth century they had spread over parts of France, Italy, Spain, and Germany. Waldes himself went as a fugitive from land to land, until at last his weary feet found a resting place in Bohemia. Some of the most dreadful persecutions the world has ever seen was visited upon this unoffending people. But the light of the Gospel had dawned upon their souls, and even the fragments of divine truth which they had been able to find were dearer to them than life itself. Their blood is mingled with that of the noblest martyrs of Christendom. For seven centuries they defended their homes in the mountain fastnesses of the Cottian Alps that form the boundary between France and Italy, with a patriotism that has had few equals in history. Crusades were led against them, but they met the blood-thirsty and plunder-seeking rabble like men who are willing to stake all on the defence of home and faith. They withstood the terrors of the inquisition with a fortitude that gives them a place among the heroes of faith. Pasquale, the young pastor of San Christo, the day before his execution as a martyr for the cause of the Gospel, Sept. 9, 1560, wrote from prison to his friends: "I am ready, if it were necessary, to die a thousand deaths for the cause of the truth." On the scaffold he spoke to the spectators, telling them that he was being executed not for any crime, but because he had clearly and openly confessed the doctrine of his Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. His last words were: "But all who hold the pope to be the vicegerent of Christ and a God on earth are in grievous error. For in fact the head of the Romish church is showing himself as the greatest enemy of Christ's doctrine and of the true faith accord-

ing to the Gospel. All his devices and acts loudly testify that he is the true Antichrist." At these words the executioner drew the rope, and after the soul of the heroic witness had taken its flight to glory, his body was burned and the ashes thrown into the Tiber. Yet in spite of crusades and inquisition the Waldensian Church was not destroyed. God preserved in it a holy seed for the evangelization of Italy in our own times, after the temporal power of the pope has been broken and Rome itself thrown open to Gospel influences.

Another ray of light that forecast the coming of the day was the appearance of a man in England who was perhaps the most important of all the forerunners of the Reformation. *John Wickliff* was born in the county of York about the year 1320. Little is known of his youth and early manhood. He first attracted public attention by opposing the payment of tribute to the pope on the part of the English people. He was at the time a member of the University of Oxford and a man of unusual learning and great courage. Indeed, the influence of Wickliff on the religious, literary, and political development of England deserves that his biography be more carefully studied than has hitherto been the case. "Wickliff's translation of the Bible, and still more, his numerous English sermons and tracts, establish his now undisputed position as the founder of English prose writing." (Encyl. Brit.) He stands to English literature in somewhat the same position as Luther does to German.

He saw in the unwarranted interference of the pope in temporal affairs a source of great danger to his fatherland, and loudly raised his voice against it. From this he passed on to attack the shameless avarice and profligacy of the priesthood, and at last denied the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation. His doctrine of the Lord's Supper was remarkable for the firmness with which he denied any change in the elements and the clearness with which he still held to the real presence. It was but natural that he drew upon

himself the hatred of the clergy. The pope demanded that he be treated as a heretic. But the pope's arm was too short to enforce such a demand in England. One of Wickliff's fundamental doctrines was that all matters of faith must be based on the Holy Scriptures. The clearness and firmness with which he held to this principle against the usurpations of Rome is shown by an expression in his great work, "Trialogus": "If there were a hundred popes, and all the monks were converted into cardinals, yet it would not be proper to accept their opinions only in so far as they are based on Scripture." The English Reformer then already had the spirit of the Smalkald Articles when they state: "Nothing else but the Word of God, not even an angel, can properly establish articles of faith." He felt that the only way out of the Babylonian captivity of the church was that the Gospel, "God's law," as he called the Bible, be "freely and truly" preached. This he not only did personally as pastor at Lutterworth, but he translated the Scriptures into English and sent out evangelists to spread its knowledge among the common people. When cited to appear and answer charges of heresy made against him, he came to Oxford in November, 1382. Though at the time, from the effects of apoplexy, he was physically broken down, yet "his spirit was unbroken and his faith wavered not." In spite of the machinations of his enemies he was permitted to remain undisturbed in the exercise of his office as pastor at Lutterworth, and died in peace Dec. 28, 1384. Thirty-one years after his death the Council of Constance declared him a heretic and demanded that his writings be burned and even his bones exhumed and thrown out of the Christian burial ground. But such was the high regard in which Wickliff's memory was held in England that for thirteen years this decree remained a dead letter. Not until the pope urged it upon the bishop of Lincoln was this shameful demand complied with. After the bones of the great Reformer had lain at rest for forty-four years, they were at the order of hte

pope's minions digged up, burned, and the ashes thrown in the river Swift.

A faithful pupil of Wickliff was *John Huss*, born 1369 in Bohemia. He was connected with the university at Prague and began to lecture on the philosophical writings of the great Englishman. He finally was also convinced of the great value of Wickliff's theological writings and began to defend many of his propositions. This already raised a suspicion against his orthodoxy. But what was still worse in the eyes of the Romish clergy, as pastor of the newly erected Bethlehem Church, he began in his sermons to attack the abuses of the priesthood. He had spoken disrespectfully of the church and even hinted that possibly the Antichrist might be found at Rome. The writings of Wickliff were declared to be heretical, and over 200 volumes were publicly burned in the court yard of the Archbishop. Huss himself was put under the ban. But, notwithstanding, he went on preaching, and lifted up his voice all the louder against the vices, ignorance, and tyranny of the clergy. Ultimately the whole city was placed under the interdict for harboring an excommunicated heretic. As long as Huss preached against the sins of the laity, says a Bohemian chronicle, he was universally praised. It was said the spirit of God spoke through him. But as soon as he began to attack the pope and the clergy, both high and low, and to reprove their pride, avarice, simony, and other vices, and to preach that it was wrong for them to possess property, the whole priesthood arose against him and declared: "he is possessed of the devil and is a heretic." When the archbishop appealed to the king in the matter, the latter is said to have expressed himself to the effect that "as long as Huss preached against us of the laity, you rejoiced; now your turn has come, and it behooves you to be satisfied." Especially against the shameful sale of indulgences he directed the shafts of his criticism. He held a public disputation on the subject, in which he defended propositions like the following: "The church has

only spiritual and no carnal weapons. It is the privilege of God the searcher of hearts alone, to declare unconditional forgiveness of sins. It is unchristian that in the indulgences, neither prayers, nor works of piety, but money alone, are considered. It is unchristian to levy a tax for the forgiveness of sins. According to the pope's bull, the devil himself might be saved if he only paid money. The true apostolic bull he declared to be that of Peter, Acts 2, 38: Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Public sentiment ran so high that Huss, at the request of the king, who had up to this time been a frequent hearer of his sermons, for a time quit the city.

At length Emperor Sigismund succeeded in inducing Pope John XXIII to convoke a general council at Constance, before which Huss was cited to appear for examination and judgment of his cause. He was promised safe conduct and a just hearing. Huss gladly accepted this opportunity of confessing the truth before the representatives of the whole church. He was well aware of the dangers that threatened his appearance in the midst of his bitterest enemies, but he was prepared to endure the worst for the cause of truth. Before setting out on the journey he wrote to the Emperor: "I will humbly risk my life (meinen Hals dran ſetzen) and under the safe conduct of your protection appear before the council." He arrived at Constance Nov. 4, 1414. For four weeks nothing was done in his case, and at length on the 28th, under the pretence that he had endeavored to flee, he was imprisoned. Dec. 4th he was cast into a filthy prison cell of the Dominican cloister. His feet were laid in irons and during the night his hands were chained to the wall. Finally, when the trial was to come off and Huss demanded an advocate, he was refused. He answered: "Well, then, the Lord Jesus will be my advocate; He will soon judge you." The filth and stench of his cell made terrible inroads on his bodily health, and, for fear they might by his death be deprived of the spectacle of

his public execution, he was removed to better quarters in the same building. But his courage and trust in God remained unshaken. He gained the confidence and sympathy of his guards and at their request wrote several devotional works. The pangs of an outraged conscience, for his breach of faith, the emperor endeavored to assuage by the declaration of the prelates, that a man was not bound to keep promises made to a heretic. On the 5th of June, 1415, after he had been dragged from one prison to another, Huss was for the first time led before the council. His writings were shown him and acknowledged. He expressed a willingness to recant in case it were shown that he had erred. Several articles were read as such in which false doctrine was taught. But when Huss endeavored to defend himself by citations from the Scriptures and the Fathers, the council broke up in an uproar. Two days afterwards he appeared again, and the presence of the emperor secured order. But no conclusion was reached until the third hearing on the 8th of June. His enemies raised the charge that Huss was a rebel against the emperor and had stirred up the people to disobey the civil authority. To the cries, Recant, recant! Huss answered: "I beg and adjure you, do not compel me to do what I can not do without violating conscience and incurring the danger of eternal damnation." He was given 4 weeks time to reconsider his course, and during that time all manner of means were employed to induce him to recant. But in vain. At length the day of his condemnation came. It was the 6th day of July, Huss's birthday. In vain he endeavored to speak in his own defence. At length falling on his knees he prayed: "O Christ, whose word has been publicly condemned by this council, again I appeal to Thee, who, when Thou wast maltreated by Thine enemies, didst commit Thy cause to that just Judge, in order that we, after Thy example, being oppressed by unrighteousness, might take refuge in Thee." After the sentence of excommunication and degradation had been read, he fell upon his knees praying: "Lord Christ

forgive mine enemies, as Thou knowest they have accused me falsely and brought false testimony and slander against me; forgive them for Thy mercy's sake." After his priestly vestments had been taken from him, each with a special curse, a cap was placed on his head bearing the inscription "Heresiarch," and the bishops said: "Now we commit your soul to the devil." Huss answered: "But I commit it into Thy hands, Jesus Christ, who has redeemed it." Led out to the place of execution, he saw on the way how his writings were being burned. Again falling on his knees he prayed the 51. and 53. Psalms, often repeating the words: "Into Thy hand I commit my spirit; Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth." When he was asked to arise from prayer he said: "Lord Jesus, stand by me that I may endure this cruel and shameful death, to which I have been condemned for the preaching of Thy word, with steadfast soul by Thy aid and that of Thy Father." He thanked his guards and affectionately took leave of them. Raised to the funeral pile and chained by the neck to the stake he said: "Gladly I bear this chain for Christ's sake, who bore far heavier ones." Called upon again to recant, he answered: "Which error shall I recant, seeing I am conscious of no errors? For I know that what I was falsely accused of, I did not even so much as think of, much less preach. But this was the foremost aim of all my doctrine, that I taught men repentance and forgiveness of sins according to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and according to the teachings of the holy Fathers; therefore I am prepared to die with a joyful soul." Now the fire was kindled and Huss cried out: "Jesus, Thou Son of God, have mercy on me." These were his last audible words. His lips moved in prayer until the terrible element had completed its work of destruction. The ashes of his consumed body were thrown into the Rhine, but his soul had taken its flight to Him who had created it, redeemed, and sanctified it. So died a martyr for the cause of

truth. But truth did not die with him. Truth is immortal; though crushed to earth, it will rise again.

About thirty years before the birth of God's chosen servant Luther, there was born in the city of Fararra, in Italy, a boy of peculiar disposition. *Gironimo Savanarola* was designed by his parents for the study of medicine. But his bent of mind led him to enter the monastery of the Dominicans at Bologna. Soon his zealous search for the truth and his hatred of the vanities of the world attracted attention. Like Luther, he fled to the seclusion of the cloister from an earnest regard for the salvation of his soul. The bent of his mind may be seen from a letter which he wrote to his father two days after he arrived at Bologna: "I could endure the enormous godlessness of the great mass of the Italian people no longer. Everywhere I saw virtue despised and vice honored. When God in answer to my prayer condescended to show me the right way, how could I resist? O sweet Jesus, let me suffer a thousand deaths rather than resist Thy will, and show myself ungrateful toward Thy goodness."

His intention was to become a so-called lay-brother and perform the menial services of the cloister, but his superiors appointed him as teacher of philosophy, and in this capacity he studied the writings of Thomas of Aquino, St. Augustine, and above all, the Bible. He was particularly interested in the study of the Old Testament prophets and the Apocalypse. This in part explains the prophetic character which afterwards formed so marked a feature of his preaching. In his thirty-eighth year he was sent to Florence as lector to the novices at St. Marco. Florence was at that time leading the world in the arts and sciences. Although in theory a republic, the city was under the sway of the powerful family of the Medici. The spiritual government was in the hands of Pope Alexander VI, than whom there perhaps never was a more profligate creature on the papal chair. August 1, 1491, Savanarola began his sermons on the Apocalypse. The church was croweded to its utmost capacity. With

scathing eloquence he laid bare the idolatry of a heathenish worship of pagan art and the abuse of civil power by those who should in a republic be the servants of the people. With equal force the shafts of his criticism fell against the profligacy of spiritual magnates and the moral corruption of the times. He demanded a reformation, not in a dogmatical, but in a moral and political sense. One peculiarity of his preaching was the keenness and positiveness with which he foretold the coming chastisements of the Almighty against this wicked generation. "Your sins make a prophet of me. Hitherto I was the prophet Jonah admonishing Nineveh. But I say unto you, if ye hear not my words, I will be the prophet Jeremiah, foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem, and lamenting over the destroyed city; for God is about to renovate His Church, and that was never done without blood." "Our prelates have introduced the feasts of Satan; they have no faith in God; they make a mockery of the mysteries of religion." "In the ancient church the cups were of wood and the priests precious as gold. Now the reverse; golden cups and wooden priests." "What art Thou doing, O Lord? Why sleepest Thou? Arise and come to deliver Thy Church out of the hands of devils, tyrants, and wicked prelates. Hast Thou forgotten Thy Church? is she no longer precious in Thy sight?" Such samples of his eloquence are sufficient to justify the expression of a certain historian who, speaking of Savanarola, says: "His word was not like the dew of heaven falling upon the soul; it was a penetrating hail, a purging whirlwind, a two-edged sword." A year after his removal to Florence he was chosen Prior of St. Marco. Against all previous custom he refused on this occasion to pay his respects to Lorenzo de Medici, the political head of the city, because he saw in this haughty worldling the chief obstacle in the way of a true moral and political reformation. At length the cloister church was not able to hold the masses that came to hear him. He began preaching in the great cathedral, and even here special arrange-

ments had to be made to accommodate the multitude. In his dying hour Lorenzo sent for the fearless monk, as he believed him to be the only one to whose honesty he could entrust the interests of his soul despairing in the face of death. After confessing the sins which harrassed his dying hour, Savanarola bid him trust to the grace of God. "I believe," answered Lorenzo. The prior then demanded that he should restore all his ill-gotten gain; even this the dying man agreed to do. But when the preacher of righteousness in his patriotic zeal finally demanded as a condition of absolution the restoration of the liberties of Florence, Lorenzo turned his face to the wall and Savanarola departed. Florence became a Christian republic with Savanarola as its lawgiver. He at once set about to carry into effect his theocratic ideas. A wonderful commotion arose among the populace. Goods unjustly gotten were restored, enemies embraced each other, worldly amusements were suspended, even married women left their husbands and entered the monasteries. Florence was at that time a city of nearly five hundred thousand inhabitants. There was a strange mixture of patriotic zeal for the theocratic state and religious fanaticism. Crowds flocked daily to the great cathedral, over the pulpit of which were inscribed the words: "Jesus Christ, King of the city of Florence." A historian of those times claimed that "the whole populace of the city seems to have become demented;" to which Savanarola answered: "And yet there is no higher wisdom than this folly for Christ's sake."

It was the intention of the strange monk to cause the spirit of reformation to go out from Florence to all Italy. The pope, at once envious of his great influence and fearful lest his own power should be endangered, used all manner of bribes to stop the mouth of this preacher of righteousness, who was daily holding up the wickedness of ecclesiastical magnates to public ridicule, and calling down the

wrath of God upon faithless prelates. The bishopric of Florence and a cardinal's hat were offered him. But, in that holy zeal which is ready to die for the truth, he answered: "I desire no other red hat than that of martyrdom, colored with my own blood."

Only too soon his desire was to be fulfilled. Savanarola was excommunicated, because he refused to comply with the papal decree which forbade his preaching until the charges against him should be examined. The position which he assumed over against this demand of the pope is very interesting: "Who forbade me to preach? You answer, the pope. I say, this is false. But here are the letters. I claim they are not of the pope. They say the pope is infallible. This is true; but just as true is the proposition, that a Christian, so far as he is a Christian, cannot sin, and yet many Christians sin because they are human. So the pope, as such, cannot err; if he errs, he is not pope. When he commands anything wicked, he does not command it as pope; consequently these letters are not of the pope. It is of the devil. I must preach because God sent me to do so, even if I should have to war against the whole world. I will still finally gain the victory." And yet he knew full well, or felt at least, what this struggle would bring him personally. "If you ask me in general as to the issue of this contest, I answer: Victory! If you ask me in particular, I answer: Death! For the Master who wields the hammer, throws it away when he has used it. So He did with Jeremiah, whom He suffered to be stoned after his preaching. But Rome will not quench this fire, and if this is quenched, God will kindle another, and it is already kindled everywhere, only they do not know it."

The fickle mind of the populace was, however, soon turned against him. Savanarola was put to the torture in the investigation to which he now had to submit. With reference to these proceedings there is nothing known of a certainty, except that in the agony of torture he cried out:

"It is enough, Lord; receive my soul!" While in prison he wrote a commentary on Ps. 51. This precious pamphlet, in which he makes the nearest approach to the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith, was afterward, in 1523, published by Luther with a suitable preface.

Luther held the Italian Reformer in high esteem. In spite of the fact that he still finds much of the dirt of human theology clinging to him, yet he hears in him a Christian who stands before God alone by His grace, and walks not in the vows and works of his monastic order, but clothed with the true armor and helmet of salvation. Antichrist had endeavored to blot out his memory, but now Christ Himself had canonized him in spite of the Papists.

His trial was of course only a form. His doom was sealed. The pope had expressed himself: "He must die, and if he were John the Baptist." With two of his faithful companions and colaborers he was condemned to death, as "a heretic, schismatic, persecutor of the holy church, and deceiver of the people." On the day of execution he gave himself and his colleagues the holy communion. He faced death cheerfully. "My Lord desired to die for my sins; and how should I not gladly give my poor life out of love for Him?" When the bishop stripped him of his priestly honors, saying, "so I sever thee from the church triumphant," Savanarola answered: "From the church militant, not the church triumphant, for this thou canst not do." He was burned in the public market place, and his ashes strewn in the waters of the Arno. But the courageous martyr still had faithful friends, and for many years after that sadly memorable 23d of May, 1498, the spot where his body scorched in the flames was strewn with flowers by unseen hands.

H. J. SCHUH.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DREAM.

SECOND ARTICLE.

We return to the image. "The form thereof was terrible," not only on account of its size and material. The heathen world had been and would be a terror to the people of God. The massing together of the different metals into one image does not only remind us of the succession of the four empires. It tells us, more especially, that paganism in all its different phases, remained essentially the same in its hostility toward the people of God. With regard to the material, the image is divided into four, resp. five parts. Kliefoth describes it in the following manner: "The first part alone, the head, represents a united whole; the second is divided from the very beginning, as shown by the arms; the third ends in division in the thighs; the fourth, being united above, is divided at once into the thighs, having, however, the power of moving; the fifth is divided from the start into the two legs, and finally runs out into the ten toes. The material becomes inferior on its downward course, gold, silver, copper, iron, clay, being indeed, through most of its parts, of metal, but constantly decreasing in worth, till lost in the common dirt. Nevertheless, the material becomes harder all the time down to the iron, which finally and suddenly gives way to the soft, frangible clay." We agree with this description: only we would rather not speak of the five parts, because Daniel mentions only four kingdoms, and there is no necessity for a different division. The third and the fourth parts, the thighs and the feet are, indeed, externally divided, but internally united by the sameness of the material, as will appear more fully in the interpretation of the dream. While Nebuchadnezzar looked upon this image, a stone was cut out without hands, which smote upon the feet of the image and broke them to pieces, also crushing the

clay, the iron, the brass, the silver, and the gold, till they became like chaff upon the threshing floor. "Without hands," means without human hands, a divine power, a power altogether different from that of worldly kings. This breaking to pieces of the great statue by the stone keeps in perfect harmony with the entire image. The toes and feet, the last empire with the ten kingdoms going forth from it, are the only parts directly struck by the stone. The gold, the silver, the brass were indeed ground to chaff by the rolling stone, but not the head, the breast, the belly, and thighs were struck by it. These latter parts, which represented the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, and the Greek empires in turn, had been overcome long ago; but the material out of which they were made, the nations that formed them, had all been absorbed by the last Roman monarchy, and were now crushed alike by the miraculous stone.

The interpretation begins with the golden head. "Thou, O King, art this head of gold." That even the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air are mentioned as subjects of Nebuchadnezzar is only done to confirm, in the glowing language of the Orient, the thought of the king's universal rule, given to him by God. Nebuchadnezzar's rule did, indeed, not embrace all the earth; but it did embrace all the nations that could lay claim to civilization at that time. Egypt, the oldest among the civilized nations, was conquered by him; Greece was as yet in its infancy, while Rome was merely a struggling little band of citizens and outlaws. Nebuchadnezzar represented the only historical, the only cultured monarchy of his time. Daniel addresses him as the golden head. This has led some writers to put the great king into contrast with his immediate successors on the throne of Babylon as the silver beast, etc. But this interpretation is impossible. For Daniel says expressly that a second, a third and a fourth *kingdom* would come. That Nebuchadnezzar was addressed personally, while the other three kingdoms

are spoken of impersonally, is explained by the fact that the great king stood before Daniel and could be addressed with "thou," which could not be done with the others.

"And after these shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee." That the Medo-Persian kingdom should be called inferior to the Babylonian, seems strange at first sight. In size it surpassed the latter; in laws and statesman-like rule it was greatly superior to it. Calvin and others have tried to solve the difficulty by referring the inferiority to the moral worth of the Medo-Persian kingdom. The inferiority of the silver to gold would naturally suggest this idea. Its weak point lies in the absence of the word "inferior" with regard to the Greek and the Roman empires, though the metal representing them decreases in value. Others have suggested that the Medo-Persian empire did not have the general, the universal character of the other three, because in its time Greece, that defied Persian rule, had already stepped into the front rank of the enlightened nations. This explanation labors under the difficulty that the third, the Greek empire, although its ecumenical character is forcibly set forth in the words, "which shall bear rule over all the earth," never ruled over Rome, which in Alexander's time certainly belonged to the historical, the civilized nations of the globe. Keil gives a better solution. The internal unity was not found in Medo-Persia, as is indicated by the arms of the images. From the very beginning two nations ruled there. The other vision of Daniel, in which he beholds the Medo-Persian empire in the image of a ram, (Chap. 8.) the first horn of which was smaller than the second, illustrates this more fully. To this day we speak of Medo-Persians, even as we speak of Graeco-Romans and Anglo-Saxons. We would add that Nebuchadnezzar, the great founder of the new Babylonian kingdom, and really its only powerful monarch, was never beaten in war. Even the mighty warrior Cyrus lost his army and life in his mad attack upon the Tu-

ranians of Transorania. While Darius Hystaspes, the greatest statesman whom Asia brought forth besides the second Califa Omar, had to flee for his life from European Scythia, and was soundly whipped by the Athenians at Marathon. No Persian king was so universally successful as Nebuchadnezzar had been. For these and other reasons Daniel might well call the Medo-Persian empire inferior to the Babylonian.

"And another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth." The Persian kingdom was overthrown by the Macedonian, which is more fully described, in the other vision of Daniel, as a he-goat that came from the west without touching the ground. The he-goat had one powerful horn between his eyes—Alexander the Great, with which he overrun the Medo-Persian ram that stood at the great river Euphrates awaiting him. Never has the world seen a kingdom raised to such gigantic proportions as that of Alexander in so short a time. The he-goat coming on without touching the ground is a bold but true figure of the Macedonian's conquest. From 333–323 the little Macedonian kingdom had expanded from the Danube to the Indus, and from the Nubian desert to the arid plains of Turkestan. The brazen belly was filled to bursting, and it did burst as soon as Alexander died. Or, to keep within the figure of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, the belly went over into the thighs. Alexander's monarchy broke into four pieces, the North, and the South, the East, and the West, as Daniel names them in his other visions. Of these four only two, the Syrian and the Egytian, came into contact with Israel; the other two, the old Macedonian in the West and the Parthian in the East, being at any rate of less importance, could therefore be overlooked in the image, leaving the two thighs to represent the Syrian kingdom of Seleucus, and the Egyptian of Ptolemaus.

"And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: for-

asmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things: and as iron breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise." Here we have a fine picture of the mighty Roman empire, the greatest, the proudest, the most enduring the world has ever seen. Rome has indeed some claim to the name of "the eternal city." "The material of which the Babylonian monarchy consisted, the countries, nations, civilization which it possessed, went over into the Medo-Persian empire, when its own rule was taken away. The same thing occurred between the Medo-Persian and the Macedonian, so that the latter contained at the same time the material, the atoms, of the old Babylonian realm." But the Roman empire, more than all the others, came to crush and to atomize every form of nationality and culture which the subjected peoples had held. It has truly been said that the Romans have been the greatest colonizers of ancient times, approached only by the Anglo-Saxon race of our own time. The Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Medo-Persians pursued the policy of colonization and denationalization to some extent, as Samaria, Phoenicea and Judea prove. But this part of their work is as mere child's play, when compared with that iron energy with which Rome Romanized every nation that came under its rule. Not only its iron hearted soldiers, whose courage and drill remain unsurpassed to this day, who fought with the same defiant bravery among the swamps of Germany and England, as under the scorching sun of Lybia and Messopotamia, accomplished this stupendous work; not only the admirable foreign policy that was passed down in the Roman Senate from generation to generation, that remained in the emperor's palace after the Republic had vanished, and even fell in all its shrewdness as in all its meanness upon the real follower of the Roman emperor, the pope at Rome, caused the wonderful success of Roman rule which we admire to this day. The greatest strength of Rome rested in its laws, which form the basis of most of the law books of civilized

nations. It is true, the laws of Rome were iron; mercy, humanity were ideas entirely foreign to the law loving Roman. Especially cruel were their laws with regard to slaves and to indebted people. The later Roman Amphitheaters, where hundreds of human lives were offered to the horrible passions of the people, were but an outflow of the slavery that treated men no better than brutes. And in money matters even the highly educated Romans used to reveal a cold blooded cruelty that makes us shudder. But cruel as their laws were, they were strong, they were iron, and as with iron bands did they oppress the conquered nations, rob them of their language, their customs, their laws and their religion and make them thoroughly Roman. Think of France and Spain, that are essentially Roman to this day, though powerful Celtic races had inhabited them before Cæsar, and though Germans conquered and ruled them after the Roman empire had fallen to pieces. The Macedonians had also introduced Greek literature and art into Asia and Africa. But these remained, to a great extent, among the privileged few, while the masses kept their own language and customs. The Greeks were the servants of the beautiful; the coarser grained Romans brought discipline and order by means of iron weapons and iron laws. The picture drawn by Daniel is perfect: "And as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise."

But the prophet continues, Dan. 2, 41: "And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of iron, part of potter's clay, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mix with miry clay." As in the three former kingdoms, the material of which the legs and feet are made represent the nations embraced by it, the masses of its inhabitants. Some have taken the mixing of clay and iron to refer to the division into the Roman and Greek empires. But that is plainly indicated by the two legs of the

image. At the time when Rome overthrew the Greek monarchies it really became divided into two halves. Politically the division was not accomplished till the beginning of the 5th century after Christ. But as Greek literature and art gained hold in Rome also; as the Greek language became the language of the educated Romans, who, for the first time, learned language and customs from a conquered nation, while it remained a ruling tongue in Asia Minor and Egypt, the Christian church also adopting this beautiful vehicle of divine thought, the division into the two halves really took place at the very time that Rome conquered Greece. Nebuchadnezzar's and Daniel's interpretation of the same again came true. The fourth kingdom was divided into two halves. Even geographically and numerically the Roman realm was about equally divided by the Adriatic Sea. But the iron was in both legs, indicating the unity of the empire in spite of its division. The Romans and Greeks are closely related Arian nations, even their gods were the same. The clay which was not in the kingdom at first, not in the legs, but in the feet and toes, we believe to be the German tribes that had proved too much even for the iron monarchy. First the borders of the Greek half of the Roman Empire, Asia Minor and the Balkan peninsula, were assaulted by the Goths and other Germans. Soon Franks and Suevians and others followed in the west. The struggle lasted from 100 before Christ till 476 after Christ, when Odoaker finally overthrew the last shadow of a Roman emperor. These German tribes well carry out the idea presented by the clay in Nebuchadnezzar's dream. In the first centuries of the Christian era they came into the Roman realm in great numbers, especially as soldiers. Nothing but the fresh blood of the Germans could have given the Roman legions that force and tenacity which held much longer than the internal strength of the empire. But the German legionaries, whose giant bodies and barbarously simple customs were so easily moulded by the iron laws of

Rome, did after all not prove an element of strength to Rome. Soon they had learned the true state of affairs, called their brethren from across the border, and turned upon their former masters and vanquished them. Clay and iron will not mix well.

Daniel continues: "And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay." Some have taken this remarkable prediction of Daniel to refer to the royal marriages between the Germans and the Romans. But, as we have stated above, the material of the image refers in every instance to the whole nations that compose the monarchies. The Germans and Romans did unite in marriage. All the Latin races of Europe, the Italians, the French and the Spaniards have German blood in their veins Without it, they would probably have almost disappeared from the face of the earth by this time, for morality had sunk to such a depth in Rome in those days that even the France of our time, although its immorality will in a few years have placed it on the list of nations that are dying out, can form no adequate example.

We do not forget the ennobling influence of Christianity, but church history proves that without the strong, healthy, chaste, German fathers and mothers, even the church could have done comparatively little to revivify the moral carcass of the Roman empire. In this respect, the mixing of the two races undoubtedly did prove an element of strength. But Nebuchadnezzer's dream deals with monarchies, with states, not with individuals; and in this respect the mingling of the Germans and Romans did not prove an element of strength. Iron and clay would not mix. Though conquered, the degenerate Roman, proud of his history, deeply despised and of course bitterly hated the invading German. It is curious to notice this Roman pride breaking forth

again and again, even at the time of the Frankish historian Martin of Tours. To the poorest Roman peasant, this powerful German lord remained foremost "the barbarian," at whose rude manner he would poke his fun whenever the strong German's fist was not too near. While in other countries and other times the invaders, the lords of the realm, had imposed their customs and language upon the people, the old rusty Roman iron overcame the pliable German clay, and crushed it into almost invisible fragments. The iron Roman law, given during the worst times of imperial tyranny, soon drove the freedom breathing German laws to the wall, and to this day students of law are bothered with the iron sediments of Romish rule. There was no true union upon an equal basis, in spite of the general intermarriages of the two nations. Least of all did the Roman monarchy, as such, receive strength from the Germans breaking into its borders. The one realm was divided again and again, war followed upon war, and when finally Charles the Great conquered a great part of the old Roman empire, his sons tore it to pieces again; and to this day no universal monarchy has risen again that might, with any degree of similarity, be compared to the fourth empire of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Nor is it at all likely to rise in the future. Again we must exclaim: the prediction has come true to the letter. It is well for the student of history to look up from the dry names and dates at times and study the philosophy of the science for a little while. Especially will the Christian find historical events interesting, when they confirm statements of God's word. We know very well, that our interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream is not shared by all. The unbelievers reject it at once, for it would prove that Daniel, even if he had lived at the times of the Maccabees, actually knew a great deal about future events, which they, of course, most vehemently deny as unscientific. But even Christians, especially among the chiliasts, have given all

kinds of interpretations different from ours, which is, as far as we know, the one generally accepted by our old Lutheran theologians. We believe this interpretation to be simple and natural, and rejoice in the confirmation of Biblical truth which it offers.

Nor have we come to the end of our image when we reached the feet. Daniel seems to care very little about the naturalistic critic of the nineteenth century who has such a dislike of prophets going into particulars. He offended him greatly once before, in the case of Antiochus Epiphanes; and now he does the very same thing by going into such insignificant little particulars as the toes of a man. But they must bear with the old prophet, especially since even to themselves those particular little things called toes do probably not seem unimportant. "And as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken." A man that is no cripple, has ten toes. As all the other parts of the body had their signification, so must the toes have their's. If head, arms and breast, belly and thighs, legs and feet represented kingdoms, the inference is natural that the ten toes also represent ten kingdoms. And this inference is verified by the other vison of Daniel related in the seventh chapter, where the ten horns growing out of the head of the fourth beast are said to be ten kings. Now it is curious that even men like the great Lutheran theologian Keil, should deny that these ten kings came at the end of the Roman empire, while they take all the other predictions of Daniel about the four kingdoms to be literally fulfilled in history. That Chiliasts would reject the historical interpretation of the ten kingdoms is not surprising. Their entire speculation about a millenium, about Christ's second coming on earth to reign with the believers for a thousand years, and His fight with the armies of the Antichrist, would be overthrown by it. For the other vision of Daniel, after telling of the ten king-

doms represented by ten horns, speaks also of a little horn coming up among the others. And this little horn, as is acknowledged on all sides, represents the kingdom of the Antichrist, the New Testament antitype of Antiochus Epiphanes. Now if the ten toes and ten horns represent historical kingdoms at the end of the Roman empire, the little horn coming right after them, uprooting three and overshadowing the others, must also represent some historical empire, and the conclusion that the Antichrist has already appeared and need not be expected in the future, would be inevitable. But, as said before, many other Christians, who do not believe in such a chimerical millenium, still deny that the ten kingdoms and the one kingdom have already come. The Lutheran doctrine that the Pope at Rome is the very Antichrist seems to be the trouble with them also. Generally they take the Antichrist to be some outward enemy of the church, some great tyrant that shall grasp the powers of ten future kings into his mighty hand, and, like the Old Testament Antichrist, hurl them against the people of God. They little understand the wiles of Satan who imagine that the Antichrist must come from without the church, perhaps be lurking in the dark masses of socialists and communists of to-day, as many suppose. The most deadly enemies always come from within. And such an old deadly foe the Church of Christ has had for almost fifteen hundred years in the bishop of Rome, that has planted himself into the temple of God like a god, as the New Testament has prophesied of him. It is little wonder that the sentimentalism of our times should also affect the church and her doctrines. Many Lutherans of to-day begin to think that good old Father Luther judged rather harshly, when he denounced the pope as the very Antichrist and popery as a work of the devil. Should such a mild old gentleman like Leo XIII, whose lips often drip with sweet words of pity for the poor, the laboring classes, etc.—should

he really be on the throne of the arch enemy of God and man? Should the Romish church, in which there are, no doubt, many pious souls, really be that little horn of which Daniel spoke, that kingdom of Antichrist which must come according to the New Testament? Is it not more in conformity with Christian charity to take this terrible odium from the poor pope, and put it upon some monster of the future, as a well known Lutheran divine of the East put it upon Napoleon III., when that ruler was in his prime? In the first place, these kind-hearted Protestants forget the difference between the papal hierarchy and the Romish church, those millions of souls bound with the iron laws of the Vatican. While we firmly believe the former to be wholly of the devil, we pity the poor ignorant souls that look up to the pope as a demigod who holds their salvation in his hands. We also believe that souls are saved to-day in the Romish church, though the work-righteousness and idolatry of that denomination are a terrible obstacle to saving faith. We believe with Luther that those souls, which are saved in Rome, are true heroes of faith, for their path was many, many times darker than our own. But at the same time the testimony of God's Word convinces us of the anti-Christian character of Rome. These good Protestants, that would like to take the odium from the poor pope, forget furthermore, that even the mild Leo XIII. never tires in denouncing Protestantism, with its doctrine of salvation by faith alone and its open Bible as the pest of the times. They further forget that in 1870 the pope publicly assumed one of the main prerogatives of divinity, infallibilty, though a dreadful thunder-storm was shaking the very foundations of the church at the time this blasphemous doctrine was announced. They overlook that with its lying wonders and doctrines popery has led more souls to hell than any heathen power ever did, even as it has killed more saints than all the Roman emperors taken together. Denying this

Lutheran doctrine that the pope is the Antichrist, of course also denies the interpretation of the ten toes or ten horns as the ten German kingdoms growing out of the fragments of the ancient Roman empire. If Keil and others admit that all the other parts of the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream represented actual historical kingdoms; if they even admit that the stone cut loose without hands and smiting the image must be the Church of Christ, it is indeed difficult to see with what reasonable excuse they stop short at the toes, cut them loose from the feet and throw them into the wide ocean of the future. It seems to us to be beyond dispute, that the ten kingdoms must have existed before they were overcome by the Christian Church. Daniel says expressly, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed." Dan. 2, 24. Only if history, which has verified Nebuchadnezzar's dream to the very letter, as we have seen, from head to foot, would suddenly forsake us at the toes; only if nothing like the formation of the ten kingdoms at the fall of the Roman empire had occurred: only then would we find an excuse for spiritualizing in this instance. But the very contrary is the case. If the fulfilling of the other parts of the prophecy was striking, here it becomes absolutely astounding. In all history we look in vain for a similar movement as that caused by the migration of the German tribes in the fourth and fifth century. Exactly ten kingdoms were built in the wide realm of the former Roman empire: 1. The kingdom of the Vandals in Northern Africa; 2. the kingdom of the Visigoths in the greater part of Spain; 3. the kingdom of the Suebians in the northwestern portion of Spain; 4. the kingdom of the Anglo-Saxons in England; 5. the kingdom of the Burgunds in Southeastern France; 6. the kingdom of the Franks in the other portions of France; 7. the kingdom of the Almains in Southwestern Germany; 8. the kingdom of the Bavarians in Bavaria; 9. the king-

dom of the Amals or Ostrogoths in Italy; 10. the kingdom of the Longobards, first in Parmonia, then in Northern Italy. Even the uprooting of three horns by the horn growing up between them may be traced in history. Three of the German kingdoms soon disappeared from the face of history, while the others remain to this day. It is true that the arms of Justinian's great generals, Belisar and Narses, overthrew and actually annihilated the Vandal kingdom of Geiserich and the Ostrogoth kingdom of Theodorich, while the German Franks subjugated the Burgunds. But it is equally true that the greatest enemy of these Arian Germans was the Catholic church with its splendid organization, which was at this very time transformed into the anti-Christian Roman hierachy. Theodorich the Great raised Italy to such a height of peace and wealth as it had not possessed for centuries. He tried his best to gain the political leaders of the Roman people, and in this he was, to a degree, successful. But he utterly failed in his measures against the Romish church, and the deep gulf of hatred that divided the Catholic Roman from the Arian Goth was the main weakness of the otherwise mighty empire. In Africa the Vandals were in a similar position; only they did not possess the wisdom and forbearance of the Ostrogoths, but bitterly persecuted the Catholics, which, of course, accelerated their downfall. And the fact that Chlodowig the Frank became a Catholic Christian, while all the other German nations that had been Christianized were Arians, was, no doubt, one of the main sources of his strength.

Thus we have tried to trace the outlines of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in history. The entire figure of the universal monarchies stands before us in the broad light of facts. From the golden head to the toes composed of iron and clay, the image is verified. We come to the last part of the dream, the stone that was cut out without hands and

crushed the image. Daniel interprets it in the following words: "And in the days of these things shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms and it shall stand forever." A beautiful description of the Church of Christ! A stone cut out without hands. Who is not reminded by it of the words of our Savior before Pontius Pilate: "My kingdom is not of this world." Of all the wonders which Nebuchadnezzar beheld in his dream, this was, no doubt, the greatest to him. And it remains the most wonderful sight to this day. Without hands! Is there anywhere in the New Testament a more beautiful account of the building up of the kingdom of God? Could any other two words tell us so much of the wonderful way in which God raises his church? All the monarchies of the world were raised with fire and sword and bloodshed. Here no human arms are needed, human hands do not rear the city of God. The Gospel with the holy sacraments is to this day an offense and foolishness to the world. And yet this Gospel of Christ has conquered millions. While all the other religious systems flatter the self-righteousness of man and pamper the Old Adam in other ways, the Christian religion is directly contrary to all our human instincts and desires. That the dreamy vagaries of pantheism with its self-deification should find many followers, is not at all to be wondered at. Man naturally glories in self. That the work-righteousness, the sword and the carnal heaven of Mohammedanism should be able to enthuse the masses of the Orient even to-day, is not surprising. The Old Adam, aside from a little outward discipline which he willingly takes upon himself, remains in full force in Islam. The human hand is visible everywhere in the upbuilding of all the other religious systems. The Church of God alone stands forth as an emblem of divine power. And well has

it been said that one of the greatest proofs for the divine character of the church is the very existence of the church. Not to speak of the outward persecutions—could any human society that proclaims as its first law the absolute sacrifice of self ever have gained a foothold upon the earth, much less become the leading power of the world, the mountain that overshadows anything the world has ever produced, as Christianity plainly does to-day? The poor, deluded Hindoo, like his cousin, the Christian monk, may tear his own flesh and willingly suffer excruciating pain; he is still serving self, his pride, his self-righteousness. But to take your reason captive under the obedience of Christ, to take up His cross and follow Him as a poor, foolish sinner that cannot even raise his hand to help himself: what human being would accept such a doctrine, if it did not contain the power of God Almighty breaking his soul to pieces and then making a new man out of him? Other religions make converts; they never truly convert. Even the Mohammedans, like the Jews of old, when they make a convert only make a child of hell of him twofold. Natural man cannot believe this supernatural religion of Christ; no natural man ever did believe it. Only after a radical change has taken place, will a man belong to this wonderful kingdom raised without hands. We Lutheran Christians should feel especially thankful to Daniel for this description of the Christian church. Without hands! The reformed Christians of any type are as astonished as was Nebuchadnezzar, when they hear that the Church of Christ really is built up without hands, without human contrivances, visible signs and the like. A little water in baptism should forgive sins? Why, that would be rolling a stone without hands, which is plainly contrary to human reason. And God does not expect of us to believe absurdities, as Zwingli said. Bread and wine the bearers of Christ's body and blood? Why, where are the hands, where are the reasonable explanations

of such palpable absurdities? What pitiable fools these Lutherans are to believe that God would institute such low and ridiculous means of saving souls, as a little bread and wine, which may be had for a penny anywhere? No, indeed, we must have something that will really draw as a true means of grace—some convincing logic, some beautiful rhetoric, some thundering appeals, some heart-rending shrieks and groans—those will convert people, not a stray drop of common water. Well, my reformed friend, the stone in Nebuchadnezzar's dream was, after all, cut out without hands. Nor did it lie still after its miraculous, its seemingly absurd origin, but it kept moving on until it became a great mountain, after it had caused the downfall of the Roman empire. As the whole image was carried out in history, so was the stone that felled the image. Without human hands did Christianity conquer pagan Rome. Though persecuted in the most horrible manner, the humble followers of the lowly Nazarene never raised a hand even in self-defense, and yet they finally triumphed. Of all the crimes of Rome, its persecution of the church was by far the greatest. By hardening itself against the reforming influence of Christ's kingdom, by waging a three-hundred-years' war against the only power that might have saved it, Rome sapped the very vitals of its power. And when finally the old empress of the world acknowledged herself conquered under Constantine, she was little better than a physical and moral wreck. The church, however, embracing till that time but a very small percentage of the Roman people, took a sudden upward flight, and a century later heathenism was only found in a few remote country places, from which fact its followers received the name of Pagans, our English Pagans, which means peasants. The little stone had grown to be a mountain, and is growing still.

And now, in conclusion, we ask again: was it not a wonderful vision, that dream of Nebuchadnezzar? True to

the letter in every historical outline! If to-day, when all these pagan empires have passed into history and, God be praised, we ourselves are resting secure in the shade of that mountain which came from that little stone cut without hands;—if in this year of grace 1890 a poet would rise and try to describe the course of all these kingdoms figuratively by a grand metaphor: no truer, no fitter likeness could be drawn than that given by Daniel long before these things happened. All the attempts of the naturalistic critics, whether in the so-called lower sphere of language and manuscript, or in the more ambitious, the "higher" sphere of authorship, time, age, etc., of the sacred writings, will prove vain. A writer in a late number of the MAGAZINE complains of the wrongness of the word "higher" with regard to Criticisms on the Bible. We understand the original meaning of the word very well; but we believe we are not doing any injustice to these miserable counterfits of theologians, that pride themselves in having overthrown the Bible from Genesis to revelation, when we apply the name "higher critics" to them in a peculiar sense. The "higher critics" generally claim this peculiar interpretation of their name themselves. The poor old Lutheran fathers were far below them; they are at the top of the ladder of all wisdom. They are in their own estimation the theologians par excellence, with a "natura naturaliter Lutherana" because defending freedom of conscience and of science; while at the same time they furiously deny the θεος in the λογος of the Bible. Their work is like that of ancient Sysiphus in the Grecian fable; every time they try to roll the rock of God's Word up the hill of naturalism, of mere human composition, it suddenly slips back to its old moorings in divine inspiration, and "the sweat of the noblest braves" is wasted. From every attack the Word of God will come forth unscathed, brighter, mightier than before; and upon the grave of the last of naturalistic critics the Bible will unfold its inspired pages and say: here I am in all my glory.

WM. SCHMIDT.

TRUST IN PROVIDENCE.

Unbelief is man's great sin. It is the natural condition of the human heart, and is therefore universal. We are not exempt from it when we become Christians, because we are not exempt from the corruption of our nature. Those who by the power of the Gospel believe in the Lord Jesus Christ are born again, so that the evil heart of unbelief does not dominate in their lives. But they are not wholly free from its influence, "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary, the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Gal. 5, 17. Therefore no one can truly say that his Christianity renders any workings of unbelief in his soul impossible. Faith and unbelief are opposites. They are inconsistent with each other. They cannot both reign in the soul. But they can strive for the mastery, and the man who is a believer to-day, notwithstanding the lusting of the flesh, may be an unbeliever to-morrow because of that lusting of flesh, which has not been effectually resisted through grace. Christians must watch, if they would be safe. "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom resist steadfast in the faith." 1 Pet. 5, 8. 9. There is constant danger that the unbelief which is natural to man will gain the ascendency in Christian souls and compass their fall and ruin.

This danger is imminent when wrong views prevail about faith in God, and when that which the Scriptures set forth as unbelief is justified and defended as human prudence and providence which the state of society renders not only excusable but necessary. False doctrine results in false life, and it is one of the wiles of the devil to confuse the understanding in order to destroy the soul. The people

perish for lack of knowledge, and but too often those who are called to teach the way of truth are themselves deceived by the cunning of Satan, and become deceivers of those whom they ought to guide and to protect against his delusions.

That we encounter difficulties when we seek to apply the teachings of Holy Scripture in regard to faith in God and trust in His providence to the various relations and duties of life, is not to be concealed. As in many other respects, when we seek to make earnest account of what the Holy Spirit says in His Word, we here meet with seeming contradictions. But they are not wise who are deterred by this from a continued and reverent study of the divine revelation given for our profit, or who are thus induced to pronounce any portion of that gracious revelation to be useless or insignificant or nugatory. The Bible means what it says, and every word that it says is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3, 16. 17. The truth given by inspiration of God in the Holy Scriptures is to be reverently accepted and studied, and will never make those free who irreverently reject it or flippantly explain it away.

"Trust in the Lord, and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed." Ps. 37, 3. God feeds us: we are to trust in Him. Whatever may be required of us in regard to our daily sustenance, the fundamental truth taught in this regard is that God provides, and that we should have faith in God and rest content. Never do the Scriptures represent the welfare of man, temporal or eternal, as depending primarily upon his own providence and industry. What is required of him as needful to this end is always set forth as subordinate to God's gift and work. Our duty is never to furnish our daily bread. It always pertains to the right use of powers entrusted to us

and of the gifts bestowed upon us by the Creator and Preserver of all things. If God do not help us, we perish, and all our care and toil and pains will not save us from perishing. God provides: all our duties center in that. We are to trust His providence and do our work in such trust: then verily we shall be fed.

Our lives, and all that preserves and sustains our lives, are God's gifts. "Do not err, my beloved brethren. Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." James 1, 16. 17. To suppose that there is some other source whence blessings flow is to suppose that there is some other god besides the Almighty Maker of heaven and earth. He alone supplies our wants, and there is no other that could supply them. "The eyes of all wait upon Thee, and Thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest Thine hand and satisfiest the desire of every living thing." Ps. 145, 15. 16. And He who rules over all and from whom alone all supplies come as free gifts of His bounty, has promised to furnish all that we need. The Lord will provide. "The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want." Ps. 23, 1. We are to trust His promises. Whatever He may require us to do and whatever it may please Him to lay upon us as a trial of our faith, His promise stands, and we are to trust Him. He has taught us to pray, and we are not to forget it. But our prayer is that He would give us our daily bread. He has taught us to work. But all our work is to be done in His service who graciously bestows upon us all that we need. We go wrong, we go fundamentally wrong, when we trust in anything but God, and expect help from any other source but God. Our help is in the name of the Lord that made heaven and earth, and other help have we none.

The Lord God, who rules and reigns in the heavens above and in the earth beneath, desires that we should

know Him and trust Him. "Delight thyself also in the Lord, and He shall give thee the desires of thine heart. Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him; and He shall bring it to pass." Ps. 37, 4. 5. In full coincidence with the teaching repeated so often in the Old Testament, is the instruction of our Lord: "Take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek): for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Matt. 6, 31–33. We have only to walk in the ways of God and let Him provide, assured that His faithfulness will not fail us and that all will be well. "Godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment let us be therewith content." 1 Tim. 4, 6–8. Therefore the apostle exhorts, "Charge them that are rich in this world that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy." 1 Tim. 6, 17.

In accordance with this plain doctrine of the Bible is the creed of Christians, who confess in the first article, as Luther explains it, not only that God has made men and all creatures, but also "that He richly and daily provides me with all that I need to support this body and life; that He defends me against all danger, and guards and protects me from all evil; and all this purely out of fatherly, divine goodness and mercy, without any merit or worthiness in me: for all which it is my duty to thank and praise, to serve and obey Him." The preservation of His creatures is as much a work of God as their creation. Only unbelief makes daily bread dependent upon aught else than God's goodness.

Shall we then from this elevating and consolating truth

draw the inference, and shape our conduct in accordance with it, that as God does all the caring and providing, we have nothing to do but idly fold our hands and await His pleasure? The Scriptures do say "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it: except the Lord build the city, the watchman waketh but in vain. It is vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late, to eat the bread of sorrows; for so He giveth His beloved sleep." Ps. 127, 1. 2. They thus impress upon us the oft reiterated truth that God alone provides for all His creatures, and that all human power is very impotence in this regard. Our care and labors and trouble avail nothing and effect nothing: what we have God gives. And He gives to His people while they sleep: He does not need their wisdom and their effort to secure their daily bread. The Scriptures do say: "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt you in due time, casting all your care upon Him; for He careth for you." 1 Pet. 5, 7. And again: "Be careful for nothing, but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." Phil. 4, 6. All trust in human strength and skill to support life is folly. But it does not follow that the strength and skill which God has given should therefore not be exerted, and that the refusal to exert them at His command must therefore be entirely without influence upon our lives. He deals with us as intelligent creatures who must give account, and therefore does not dispense us from the work which we can do or exempt us from the evil consequences of our neglect.

He commands men to labor. This was His ordinance in the original creation of our race. "God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." Gen. 1, 28. "And the Lord God took the man, and put him in the garden of Eden, to dress it and to keep it." When, according to His

ordinance, men multiplied in the earth, He commanded them to execute His will toward one another, and thus to serve each other while they served Him. "Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor until the evening." Ps. 104, 23. It belongs to the praises of the virtuous woman that "she looketh well to the ways of her household; and eateth not the bread of idleness." Prov. 31, 27. "When we were with you," writes St. Paul, "this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busy-bodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work and eat their own bread." 2 Thess. 3, 10–12. The divine ordinance of labor is part of the general plan by which God governs the world.

Man's obedience or disobedience to this ordinance is not without effect upon his life and its surroundings. God does not need our work to enable Him to supply us with the necessaries and conveniences of life, neither is there merit in human labor that could induce God to care for us or place Him under obligation to provide for us.

> "Merit lives from man to man
> And not from man, O Lord, to Thee."

God owes us nothing, and never can be made to owe us anything. But He is Sovereign, and can dispense His gifts according to His own good pleasure. If He chooses to give less to the husbandman who idles his time away than to the other who ploughs his field in the proper season and makes his hay when the sun shines, who shall prevent the execution of His will? That will He has made known to us in sufficient measure to discourage idleness and stimulate industry. While He does not always apportion His earthly gifts in strict accord with the labor put forth by their recipients, just as He does not always bestow temporal goods ac-

cording to the righteousness of men, He does warn us against the consequences of idleness, just as He makes promises to the righteous man which are not made to the ungodly, in regard to the things of time. "How long wilt thou sleep, O sluggard? A little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep; so shall thy poverty come as one that traveleth and thy want as an armed man." Prov. 6, 9–11. The neglect of duty is in many instances the neglect of the natural means which God uses for the supply of temporal gifts to man, and therefore the debarring of individuals from the possession of these gifts, through their own fault; and where there is no such relation of cause or instrument, or where there is at least no such relation apparent, the truth is still manifest, that "the Lord will not suffer the soul of the righteous to famish, but He casteth away the substance of the wicked. He becometh poor that dealeth with a slack hand, but the hand of the diligent maketh rich." Prov. 10, 3–4. The fact that God provides, and He alone, in no wise conflicts with His imposing obligations of service upon us, or with His taking our fidelity in rendering such service into account in dispensing His gifts.

Hence it does not follow that every step that is taken or every means that is employed by man to secure a livelihood or obtain a competence is inconsistent with the duty of trusting in God. On the contrary, trust in God embraces trust in the means which God appoints and in the ways which He adopts to effect His purpose. The duty of looking to Him for our daily bread does not render null or needless the command that we should work and eat our own bread, just as the duty to have confidence in God's protecting care does not justify us in the neglect of known means to guard us against danger and death. God will furnish us with the necessaries of life, but we have no promise that He will feed us if we persist in lazily lying upon our backs and refusing to move a foot or finger to obtain food; God will preserve

us, but we have no assurance that He will keep us alive if we cast ourselves into the fire or the flood. "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Matt. 4, 7. Trust in God does not exclude, but obviously includes, the use of the means which God employs to secure the ends of His providence.

Just as little can it be inconsistent with such trust to lay stress upon prayer as an important element in the plan by which God governs the world. God does supply the wants of all according to His good pleasure. "O Lord, Thou preservest man and beast." Ps. 36, 6. But the same promise is not given to those who seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness and to those who do not seek it; and the same comforting assurances which are given to those who pray in faith are not given to those who do not trust God and do not ask in confidence. "All things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." Matt. 21, 22. Those who do not ask, or who do not trust in God when they do outwardly ask, have no promise that they shall receive, although God gives them also whatever they have. "Ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts." James 4, 3. The Lord governs according to His own good pleasure, and He is pleased to make all things work together for good to them that love Him. Why should He not take into account their prayers and their labors, which they by His grace are pleased to order according to the good will which He has made known to them in His Word? He graciously leads them into a knowledge and acceptance of His wise and benevolent plans, and their trust in Him finds its appropriate expression in the prayers and labors which are in accord with His Word and the faith embracing it and clinging to it. Therefore we are to trust in the Lord and do good, not sit in listless idleness. "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2, 10.

Trust in God's providence therefore does not in any way conflict with such activity on our part as God commands, or with the conviction that such activity, because of God's providential plan and government, will have an influence upon the course of events in our lives and our welfare as moral beings. But it does conflict with putting any trust in our own ability or management, with trust in our work or wealth, with confidence in any creature for the preservation of our lives or the supply of our wants. If our help comes from God alone, our trust must be in Him alone, and all trust in the things which He made, or in the powers with which these things have been endowed, is idolatry. That is a deadly sin. "Thus saith the Lord, Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord. For he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh; but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness in a salt land and not inhabited. Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is." Jer. 17, 5–7. The Lord will keep His word, and those who put their trust in it shall never be put to shame, while those who put their trust in the creature are leaning upon a broken reed. If God be for us, all the powers of earth and hell shall not be able to prevent our prosperity; if God be against us, all the cunning and craft of men and devils cannot save us from ruin. If we trust in the Lord and walk in the way of His commandments, it must be well with us, because He makes all things work together for good; if we do not trust in Him and His promises and guidance, and foolishly mark out a course for ourselves that deviates from His ways and contravenes His will, disaster and failure must inevitably result. What God would have us to do is to walk in His paths of wisdom and righteousness and wait for His blessing, though our patience be tried in the waiting; if we choose our own paths, independently of His plan and commandments, there

can, according to the word of the Lord and in the nature of things, be no ultimate blessing.

It is therefore a vain thing for men, under the plea and pretence that they must make a living somehow, to devise schemes and contrive plans to get money and goods without a strict regard to love and justice. The very thought that *they* must get it is sinful, and from this bitter root all sorts of bitter fruits grow. Christians must know that getting bread is not the main thing, and that it is better to die, if the will of God be so, than to live a life of selfishness and sin under the curse of heaven. "Whosoever will come after me," saith the Lord, "let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life, shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life, for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it. For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" Mark 8, 34–36. There is no sense and no wisdom in the babble about a necessity laid upon us, because of the evil customs and methods of a wicked world, to depart from the stern demands of righteousness in order to make a living. Translated into plain English, that only means that God's government has proved a failure, and that now men are thrown upon their own resources and must use their own ingenuity to save their lives in the wreck. Infidels may talk so; it is their trade; but when professing Christians chime in with the stupid and blasphemous gabble, the offense is rank, and the Church has reason to be shocked, and, if such insult to high heaven is left unrebuked, to be alarmed.

Have faith in God. That is a primary lesson to be learned. He rules and He provides, and He doeth all things well. Trust in Him. Without this to start with, life will go wrong. Schemes and societies will be formed to get dollars that have never been earned, and breaches of charity and righteousness will be justified as a prudent adaptation of means to secure a livelihood. The boundary lines between

right and wrong become dimmer, and finally the devil has things his own way. Resist him. Trust in God. Walk in His way. Do what He bids you. Be sure that you are called to the work in which you are engaged, and do it in His name. Do it faithfully as His servant. Then let Him provide. "Trust in the Lord, and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land; and verily thou shalt be fed."

M. Loy.

HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL TEXTS.

Translated from Rudelbach by Rev. C. H. Rohe.

Are historical or doctrinal texts, or a certain mixing of both, to be considered most conducive to the instruction and edification of the congregation?

If it is granted, that the historic material in the Holy Scriptures is not merely piled up beside the doctrinal, but that it rather constitutes the foundation of the latter, then there can be no reason for speaking about excluding the one or the other, but only about arranging them in the right relation. Inasmuch as the historical portions of Scripture seem especially in our time to be called in doubt by many who always speak about knowledge and never attain to a knowledge of the truth, and as very few historical pericopes are contained in the last selected courses, it may not be superfluous to explain briefly the principle stated above.

The entire divine revelation is in its essence a history of the dealings of God with man—a history of the divine facts, by which a new life in faith was created. The historical element is therefore not only the frame of the revelation or its garment, but the clear and distinct testimony, that a revalation from God to man has taken place. As the Old Testamemt begins with history, so also the New; as the

historical there is the broad and solid foundation, so also here. As in the Old Testament the doctrinal part everywhere refers back to the historical foundation and without it can never be fully understood, so also in the New. As in the Old Testament prophecy comprehends both history and doctrine in a higher order and forms the living capstone of the revelation, so also in the New. In a word, everything in the Holy Scriptures points out to us the work of the Divine Spirit, in which deed and word, doctrine and history, are most intimately connected and, as it were, grown together. There is no historical description in the Scriptures without the corresponding element of doctrine; but, on the other hand, the element of doctrine is nowhere stated so nakedly, that you are thrown out of the region of holy history: for this would be to leave the basis of the revelation. The Scripture therefore itself preaches to us here as everywhere with a loud voice: What God has joined together, let no man put asunder. What God has ordered for the edification of the body of Christ, must in the highest degree be serviceable for edification. All prophetical and apostolical Scripture is inspired by God, and "all Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. 4, 16, 17.) Let no one fear therefore, that the doctrinal element will be crowded out by the historical; no, it will rather be wakened and vivified thereby. On the contrary, let us fear, what justly may be feared, namely that by expunging or at least setting aside the historical element the way will be opened to Naturalism and Deism, when the Christian spirit of faith is not so much the more alive and alert. The healthy, uncorrupted sense of the people already speaks clearly here: they love the historical portions, hear them gladly, but do not feel at home and with reason do not trust entirely, when an uninterrupted

series of doctrinal portions is given them. Let this wisdom of the people, although found on the streets, by no means be despised. God Himself has inscribed the elements of it in the bosom of every man, how much more of every Christian? The historical has not without reason an irresistible attraction for man; even our life is a history of the dealings of God on a small scale. And where is the pious man who will not feel himself lifted up and quickened, when he steps into the great, immeasurable, and yet childlike-simple history of His kingdom on earth? It is the Father's drawing to the truth of that revelation, which was made in His Son, when we see that He has laid the history of it so near to our hearts and given us the first draughts of it so to speak, with our mother's milk.

But let nobody suppose that I wish to disparage the didactic element in the selection or arrangement of the pericopes by thus defending the historical. The one comes from the Spirit of God as well as the other, and as all doctrine is founded on history, so much, on the other hand, all history of the divine revelation leads us into the doctrine. All false one-sidedness avenges itself doubly, yea ten-fold in the realm of holy things, and only the union, as it is given in the holy Scriptures, will save us all from going astray. Therefore must the doctrinal also retain its rightful place and prove itself a nutrifying as well as a defensive element and thereby at the same time a word of life and of spirit, which cannot proceed from any other but from Him, who had life in Himself, and from those to whom He gives His Holy Spirit who leads them into all truth.

EDITORIAL BREVITIES.

It has become the fashion, in some circles, to speak contemptuously of the so-called "hog-leather theology". This is not by any means a result merely of the somewhat sud-

den revolt of the Missourians against the old theologians, whom they once quoted so largely and upon whose testimony they once laid such great stress, but who were found against them in their predestinarian new departure. That would not create a prejudice among our pastors, who are happily little influenced by the vagaries of Missouri. Probably the restless hankering after novelties, which is so characteristic of those days of invention, has much more to do with it. But whatever may be the cause, the fact is potent, that even some among us speak of the old authors as if their works were antiquated and had been rendered useless by our modern improvements. We would like to speak a word not only in defense, but in commendation of this "hog-leather theology". Buy it, study it, feed on it, grow strong by it. Of course the old Lutheran writers, from Luther downward, were fallible men, like the rest of mortals, and nothing can be accepted merely because they wrote it. But in those old books of past centuries there are treasures of wisdom and knowledge, derived from the true source of all wisdom, which modern books have never equalled. These latter have more parade of learning and more pomp of language; but if you want to get at the root of the matter, study these old theological masters. That will secure thoroughness and clearness such as the new theologians generally fail to impart. It is to be feared that at least some of those who turn up their noses at sight of a massive old volume bound in swine's leather, do so not because they have learned that modern writers set forth the old truth more fully and forcibly, but because they have never learned to appreciate that old truth in its fullness and force. We advise our young ministers to study these old theologians and keep studying them. They will be a guide in the wilderness of modern theological speculation.

Ministers must have libraries. They cannot effectually do their work without them. A man who must teach all

the year round must be learning all the year round. Those who will not study will not be successful. Their sermons will degenerate into empty phrase-mongering or stale repetition that leaves souls unsatisfied. But in order to study one must have books. The pastor must have a library. That is of first importance. He need not buy a house or a farm; he can ordinarily manage to get along without buying a horse or carriage; but he must buy books. They are indispensable for his work. The young minister should therefore, in laying his plans for the investment of his little means, think first of all of securing a good working library. In some way the people must be brought to know that this is necessary for their good as well as for his own. If he is to work effectually among them he must have books, and they are pursuing a suicidal policy if they withhold from him the money necessary to purchase books. But he is equally guilty if he wastes his money on things which, though they might otherwise be desirable and proper, he can do without, and should do without if they hinder him from buying the books that he needs for his work. We need not be told that our pastors are often so poorly salaried that little can be spared for the library. This is true, and it is a pity. Certainly a minister is excusable if he thinks of getting food and clothing for his family before purchasing the precious volumes for which his soul longs. But it makes a sad impression on one who knows what is needful to see in a minister's house a sumptuous parlor and a beggarly library. One must doubt in such a case whether the soul has had the proper longing and whether the volumes have seemed precious. Dispense with luxuries and replenish the library. But do not forget to make diligent use of it.

Preaching requires preparation. Not only must the preacher be educated before such a work can be entrusted to him, but every sermon must be prepared. How is this to

be done? There is ample room for diversity of judgments and tastes and habits in this regard. Not all will be likely to pursue precisely the same course, nor is it necessary that they should. But there are some things that all must do if they would be faithful ministers of Christ. Their commission is to preach the word. They are not to set forth their opinions and fancies on all sorts of topics that might interest them or their hearers. On fitting occasions and at appropriate places they may give utterance to their thoughts and sentiments respecting science and art and literature and life. The fact that a man is a preacher does not prevent him from being concerned about the things going on in the world around him and saying what he thinks and feels in regard to them. But the pulpit is not the place and the assembly for worship is not the time to ventilate his opinions on such topics. He is commanded to preach the Word, that those who hear him when he preaches may hear the Lord, and be sure that they are hearing the saving truth of God, and not mere human opinions about which they may differ. That makes it necessary that he should begin his preparation by taking a text, and continue it by a thorough study of the text. The contents of this the sermon is to set forth and apply. This is the Word that on this occasion he is to preach. To this he should confine himself, and what the Lord communicates in this he should draw out and set forth. That there may be unity in the discourse, that it may be a sermon, and not a promiscuous aggregation of pious reflections, he should have a theme, which means that he should gather the contents of his text under one head and exhibit all the parts in their relation to the central thought. This implies the arrangement of the material in proper order, so that which belongs together is placed together in the sermon. Then the preacher is prepared to show the hearers what the Holy Spirit says in this text. What more he shall do in the way of preparation for the

preaching of the sermon will depend on circumstances. Ordinarily it would be advisable to write it out word for word as he desires to deliver it. That is always the surest and the safest way, enabling the preacher to bestow more care on the selection of his language and the presentation of biblical proofs and illustrations than any other method of preparation. When circumstances will not admit of this, meditation may supply the place of writing. Then pray for the Lord's blessing and go to the pulpit in the Lord's name.

MISSIONARY DEPARTMENT.

IN CHARGE OF REV. E. PFEIFFER, A. M. OF DELAWARE, O.

THE STUDENT VOLUNTEER MOVEMENT.

With considerable right and reason the present is called the greatest missionary century since the apostolic era. In the first three centuries of its existence Protestantism was aggressive in conquering for the Christian faith the waste places. The Lutheran Church has perhaps never been so pronounced and prominent in her missionary activity. While there has always been a select few in her fold who appreciated in its whole length, breadth and depth the command of the Lord to proclaim the gospel to every creature, and in a small way the propaganda of gospel truth was carried on, for instance in Greenland, East India and elsewhere, even before the subject attracted general attention in other sections of the Protestant Church, yet it must be confessed that in the Reformed Churches of America and England originated and was fostered that good missionary enterprise and movement which has in our day and date re-

sulted in casting the net of the gospel over almost the whole world. While our church is now too in the harness, she can nevertheless not claim the leadership in the work except possibly in the department of Jewish missions and in the church propaganda among the emigrants of the Northwest.

But certain it is that no sphere of church work enjoys to a greater extent the favor of co-operation of Christians in our generation than does the Christianization of the heathen nations. A task, which it was so difficult to impress a century ago upon the minds and hearts of even the most aggressive Christians, is now regarded a self-evident duty, and the points of deliberation are now no longer the work, and its justification, but rather the means and methods of doing it in the most efficient manner.

One of the most remarkable features in this general interest taken by every section of the church in the work of the gospel is the rapid growth and seemingly healthy development of the Student Volunteer Movement. This is not to be confounded with agitations of an apparently similar nature on a smaller scale carried on before, the most prominent one of which was and is the Inter-Seminary Alliance. The object of this agitation is by holding annual meetings of representations of the students in the leading seminaries of the different denominations, to awaken a zeal and love for missions among those who are preparing for the Christian ministry. Some eight or ten such meetings have been held with the result that not a few theological students have determined to do their life's work among the heathens. As this movement has not been solely in charge of the students themselves, but to a great measure has been in the hands and leadership of experienced pastors and professors, it has undoubtedly accomplished a great deal of good for the mission cause and been instrumental in sending quite a number of gospel messengers to those yet in darkness.

The Student Volunteer movement, while differing not

materially from the ideal and idea of the Inter-Seminary Alliance, yet it is very much wider in its scope and more organized and thorough in its methods. Its aim and object is to arouse in the thousands and thousands of students, male and female, in the colleges, seminaries, academies, and other schools of a high grade throughout the whole length and breadth of the United States, a deeper interest in the cause of missions and a personal devotion to the work. This interest and devotion shall express itself first of all and chiefly in the determination on the part of the student to dedicate their lives to the work, and on the completion of their course themselves to become the embassadors of the cross in heathen lands, or missionaries in the narrow sense of the word, as medical missionaries, as teachers, as colporteurs, Bible agents, or in whatever capacity they can render assistance and aid to the glorious victory of Christianity. As a secondary object, the movement seeks to organize the students of the various institutions into alliances and societies which have as their object to support missionaries of their own, and there are dozens of such organizations which accomplish this end, just as there are many wealthy congregations—the East, particularly, which supports a missionary of their own. The Volunteer association does not aim to antagonize any of the existing mission societies that labor under the auspices of the various denominations, but rather seeks to co-operate with these. On its own responsibility and under its own direction it sends out men and women only when these cannot labor under the mission authorities of their own churches. For this reason, too, it does not seek to establish any missionary educational institution, but leaves this work to be done by the schools already in existence. Whatever meetings are held by the friends of the movement, aim chiefly and indeed solely at arousing a mission zeal and urging a mission activity through the avenues already opened and through the channels existing in the various denominations.

It is simply phenomenal and may almost be counted among the miracles of modern missions, how this agitation has taken soil and root among the students of America. The movement was inaugurated only in 1886, yet the number who have volunteered to go is about five thousand. The matter has been agitated in about three hundred colleges and other institutions. The latest exact data are that there were last March 4,752 volunteers; of these, about 250 have already been sent out. They are found chiefly in China, Japan, India and Africa, scattered in 21 different fields and representing 25 different organizations. Others are under appointment and ready to sail, while still others have decided to go to foreign lands independently and without connecting themselves with any home organization. Of the total, about 1,750 (35 per cent.) are college students; 125 (2½ per cent.) are medical students; 450 (9 per cent.) are theological students; 650 (13 per cent.) preparatory and academic students; 200 (4 per cent.) are common school students; 500 (10 per cent.) are not students, but have been privately educated; 500 (10 per cent.) are out of school at present on account of health or lack of means. Besides these, 275 have completed their course. Only 250 have given up their intention of going, and about 50 have been rejected on account of ill-health or other reasons.

Of these same persons 250 have gone out 150 have completed their course and are ready to go out soon. There are 400 who expect to complete their course in 1890; about 550 will complete their course each year for the next four years, while 1,200 will have more than four years before them. About 500 are uncertain as to the time required to finish on account of health or means.

There are now between 90 and 100 missionary boards, and societies organized in colleges for promulgating the missionary spirit in their respective localities, but volunteers are reported from 300 institutions. There are pledged for the support of missionaries through the influence of the

movement: by colleges $19,450; by seminaries $9,850; by charters $13,000; by miscellaneous bodies $3,400. These figures include single contributions and permanent annual pledges—of which there are many since the object is to put the movement on a good and abiding basis—but omit all work done in 1890 and much done previously and not reported at all. During the present season more is being done than ever before.

The Volunteer Movement is one of the results of Mr. Moody's labors for and among the American college students. All things considered he is certainly the best and most evangelical among the many so-called evangelists that the last ten or fifteen years have produced. It is a singular fact that he, who has never been a college student, and whose technical education is sorely deficient, should have been in our day the chief means for arousing a deeper interest in Christianity among the college students of our land. Every summer he holds conferences and assemblies to which hundreds and hundreds of college students hasten to listen and to learn what is said and taught on the subject of Christian religion. In the last two or three years these meetings have been held at Northfield, Mass., and those in attendance have enjoyed the privilege of listening to some of the ablest and most famous Christian teachers and speakers of America and England. In 1886 the conference was held at Mt. Hermon, Mass., and more than two hundred and fifty students were present from eighty-nine colleges in the United States and Canada, to spend four weeks in Bible study. At the conference this summer the number is much larger, and as missionary pupils are present, also representives of nearly all of the leading Protestant Universities of Northern Europe. At the Mt. Hermon meeting nearly two weeks had passed before the subject of missions was ever touched. The idea originated out of a young student from Princeton, who had come with the determination to win a few of the young men for the mission cause. He called a meeting of them who were thinking seriously of spending their lives in the fiery

field, and twenty-one answered the call. The idea caught and a few days afterwards a special mass meeting was held in the interest of the work, which was addressed by that mission enthusiast and writer, Dr. A T. Pierson, of Philadelphia, who last winter made a tour of the British Isles, and addressed hundreds of packed halls and churches on the subject that fills his head and mind. The key note of this address was that "*all should go and go to all.*" On the 24th of July another meeting was held known as the "Meeting of the Ten Nations." It was addressed by sons of missionaries from China, India, and Persia, and seven young men of different nationalities—an Armenian, a Japanese, a Siamese, a German, a Dane, Norwegian, and an American Indian. The addresses were not more than three minutes in length and consisted of appeals for more workers. At the close each speaker repeated in the language of his country: "God is love." Then came a season of audible and silent prayer. Before the final close of the conference, the number of volunteers had increased from twenty-one to exactly one hundred. who signified that they were "willing and desirous, God permitting, to become foreign missionaries."

At once steps were taken to have the subject agitated throughout all the institutions of the country. A deputation of four students of the Mt. Hermon conference was selected to visit as many of the colleges as possible. Of them four only one, Mr. Robert P. Wilder, a Princeton graduate was able to undertake the work. He has been in the work ever since and to no other man is the success of the movement due to a greater degree than to him. Only during the present year has he withdrawn, in order to complete his theological studies and then go out himself as a missionary.

Mr. John N. Forman, also a Princeton graduate, was induced to accompany Mr. Wilder. The expenses of the trip was paid by a pious layman. During the first year one hundred and sixty-seven institutions were visited and 2200 pledges secured. The great movement had been inaugurated and has increased steadily ever since. During the college

year 1887–88 not quite so much was done, but 1888 brought with it a thorough organization of the movement by the establishment of an Executive Committee to control and direct the whole matter. To this is added an Advisory Committee of seven persons, five of them from the leading denominations and one each from the Young Men's and the Young Women's Christian Association. Indeed the plan of operations is to do much of the work in connection with these Associations. The whole territory has by no means been covered. The colleges of the far West and of the South have not yet been visited and yet the movement has far outgrown the expectation of even the most sanguine friends. Neither Mr. Wilder nor Dr. Pierson ventured to claim a thousand volunteers in the American colleges when the plan was first conceived.

Nothing in the modern annals of Mission work equals this remarkable movement. That in some points it is open to criticism is conceded by its friends also and a careful examination would probably develop objectionable features not admitted by them. But yet it is an evidence all convincing that the Gospel is yet a power in the land, and is especially cheering because it is so powerful a factor in the hearts of our college men, who two or three generations ago were known more by their scepticism and infidelity than by their faith and Christian principles.

The institutions least affected by the movement are probably those of our own church, just as a proportion of our own church is the one which of all the American denominations does the very least for foreign missions. While there is some excuse for this, in the tasks and labors awaiting our attention by the arrival of the tens of thousands of our brethren in the faith coming from Lutheran state churches in Europe to settle in the Northwest, yet that does not absolve us from our duty toward those that are without. It is in general one of the great weaknesses of the American Lutheran church, that tacitly at least, it is accepted that we have done our duty if we merely hold our own. On the contrary, just we of all others have the great-

est duty of aggressive conquest without, for we have the whole truth and this possession brings with it special obligations toward those who have it only in part or have it not at all. While we would not advise Lutheran schools directly to join in the agitation as it is being conducted at present, it certainly would be the part of wisdom if the missionary spirit would enter our seminaries, colleges and other schools. While there are literary, homiletical and other societies in connection with our institutions, there are no missionary societies. Indeed, there are but few organizations of any kind in our schools that, like the mission societies, aim at a development of piety and Christian spirit and activity in the students. The head crowds out the heart, although the work of the former is useless without the guidance of proper principles in the latter. Missionary thought, study, zeal and devotion in our college students, even if it has no other results, will be a fine educational means. The next generation of American Lutherans must do more for the spread of the kingdom of God than ours is doing. G. H. S.

LITERATURE.

Das Studium der Mission auf der Universitæt. Ein Beitrag zur Beantwortung der Frage: "Was musz geschehen um den Missionssinn in der heimathlichen Kirche zu beleben und zu vertiefen?" Von Dr. G. Warneck. Guetersloh. Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann. 1877.

This is a pamphlet of 46 pages, being a reproduction of an article by the author in his *Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift*, and, although written thirteen years ago, and with special reference to German universities, this essay, by a well known leader in missionary thought, deserves to be read by every student and professor and pastor in the Joint Synod of Ohio and in America.

The question with which the author starts out, and which he proceeds to answer in his usual thorough and com-

prehensive manner,—"Does the study of missions belong to the university?"—is not essentially changed when it is applied to our circumstances and made to read: *May the study of missions properly claim a place in our college and seminary courses?* And whilst this may be a debatable question, and there may be a considerable divergence of opinion among us with regard to its practical realization, it seems to us that no apology is needed for raising the question, and inviting and provoking thought and discussion upon it. It may be that well grounded objections may be raised to the introduction of an additional branch of study into our already crowded curricula, and that apparently insurmountable difficulties may present themselves in the way of the actual doing of that which might seem very desirable and proper. But there can, in our opinion, be no question either about the desirability or the necessity of doing something that shall lead our students more generally into the refreshing and quickening stream of the grand missionary movements of our age, and that shall tend to awaken and foster in our candidates of theology more generally an intelligent interest and a flaming zeal in behalf of the world's evangelization. We do not propose just now to enter into an argument on the subject. Our immediate purpose is to elicit reflection and remark. There is among us pastors apparently a rising tide of interest in the theory and work of universal missions. There is unquestionably among us more inquiry and research and endeavor in this direction to-day than there appeared to be a decade since. This is one of the most hopeful and encouraging indications for the future of our Synod. We are waking up to the necessity of bringing this subject to bear on our people and arousing them to action in a manner and measure such as has not generally been done heretofore. But whilst the importance and the inspiring nature of the task elate and cheer us on, its magnitude and difficulties and our own lack of adequate preparation rise up before us and not only dishearten and discourage us, but threaten to foil our desires and prevent the execution of our plans. What can be done to improve matters? Is there not a vital connection between our wants

in this regard and the supplies received in our student days? Is it not time that more regard be had in our schools to the demands that the present time and situation make upon our pastors also in the line of missionary intelligence and enterprise? Why cannot arrangements be made, by which the tide of missionary interest that is washing at our feet shall receive mighty impulses and refreshing supplies from our schools of the prophets? Does not a score of considerations that arise in the mind of every faithful pastor call loudly for additional missionary resources at our fountain-heads of learning?

About the desirability and necessity of improvement in this regard there seems to be no room for debate. What the means and methods of improvement are to be is another question. This is open for discussion and deliberation. Here opinions will vary. But the question, it seems to us, is too important and vital hastily or carelessly to be set aside. It ought to be discuseed. It deserves to be pondered by pastors and professors and students. Different ways may be pursued to reach the desired end. Which way will be the most feasible and efficient under varying circumstances it is not for us here to decide. It may be that, as Dr. Warneck holds in the pamphlet before us, the science of missions ought to be taught in university and seminary as a legitimate and important branch of theology. Late treatises on theology have begun to devote more attention to halieutics and evangelism. In Germany this broader movement of modern times is beginning to find a place in pastoral theology. Is not this subject of sufficient relative and absolute importance to deserve more specific attention in our course than it has heretofore received? Another plan—the favorite American method—which even Dr. Warneck calls "nachahmungswert"—is that of having a course of lectures on missions delivered before the students every year by some representative man, thoroughly qualified for the task. In no wise conflicting with this plan, but working hand in hand with it, is that of conducting a students' missionary society.

As a timely and valuable contribution on this topic from the pen of one whose experience, ability and earnestness entitle him to be heard, we commend this essay by Dr. Warneck to the careful attention of our brethren. The author starts out with the argument that the subject of missions should be specifically treated in the seminary because it properly constitutes an integral part of theology—of church, history and exegesis, to some extent also of dogmatics and ethics, but more especially of practical theology. He claims, for example, that, just as homiletics, catechetics, liturgics poimenics have become independent branches of practical theology, so "*evangelistics*," as the theory of missionary enterprise, may with equal propriety and justice lay claim to similar treatment. He shows how essential it is both for the prosperity of the churches at home and for the progress and prosecution of missions abroad that there be *above all things faithful, energetic, firm, fervent and hopeful pastors.* He speaks very freely and frankly of the relation that may and ought to exist between theological professors and pastors of this stamp—of the opportunities of the former to mold the latter. The last ten pages of the treaties are devoted to students of theology themselves. He discourses at length on the practicability and utility of missionary societies among the students, giving also directions and instructions with regard to the best mode of conducting them. But here, too, he shows how important and indispensable is the presence of a professor who is aglow with missionary enthusiasm. He says apologetically: "Thus we always come back again to the professors." The latter stand to the missionary spirit and interest of their students very much in the same relation as the pastor does to the missionary life of his people.

We take this opportunity of stating that the Publication Board has made provision for the regular importation from Germany of the most needful and excellent missionary literature. This ought to encourage the brethren to replenish their libraries and supply themselves and their congregations with an occasional missionary feast.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. X. OCTOBER, 1890. No. 5.

THE UNION OF ALL LUTHERANS.

THE PRACTICAL SIDE OF THE QUESTION.

Inasmuch as unity in the one true faith is enjoined by Scripture, it is a divine obligation and one that rests on all Christian believers. Besides, the holy pleasure and the high profit which such unity affords constitute a reward which far outweighs all the labor and pain that may have to be endured for its attainment or preservation. Christians are thus most earnestly urged on and lovingly invited to work and pray without ceasing in order that they may become and continue to be one in the truth of God. And so long as the object to be obtained is agreement in what is really the one true faith, and the means employed towards its consummation are in thorough accord with the divine Word, we admit that too much cannot be done in this line of Christian endeavor. There is only one way that leads to the unity in the faith; and that way is a sincere love of, an unswerving fidelity to, and a diligent and prayerful search for the truth given unto men for their salvation. In a love and search for saving truth like this, excess is impossible; and wherever the desire for unity is merged into one with fidelity to the truth, there would we have a "unionism" that is in no danger of being overdone. With so much ad-

mitted in the premises, why do we nevertheless antagonize the unionism of our times? and why do we, in particular, look with suspicion on the many restless efforts put forth nowadays to unite our own divided church? We are well aware that by this our attitude of hesitation, or of opposition, as the case may be, we incur the displeasure of many brethren whose friendship, were it accorded us, we would hold in the highest esteem; and we know too that among others we render ourselves liable to charges so grievous that, if true, must condemn us. We are told every now and then, if not in plain words yet in ways that cannot be misunderstood, that we are a "narrow-minded, self-conceited, and willful set," and that, by wantonly arraying ourselves against its general union, we "criminally hamper the Church in the discharge of its glorious mission." Woe be to us if our accusers are in the right! All the more let us make sure of our position, and sure that our defence before men will not fail us before God, the common Judge of us all.

It seems to us that the desire for the union of all Lutherans is in imminent danger of running wild in some sections of our church; that with some of our people it partakes altogether too much of the nature of mere human enthusiasm, and hence suffers from the weaknesses indigenous to unholy passion. Among other things the disreputable slogan, "Let us agree to disagree," has been laid to their charge; and it is to be feared that there is some ground for the reproach.

It is a characteristic of unionism everywhere that it makes too much of union and too little of unity; and that is the trouble also with our own union enthusiasts. They readily concede that churchly union, in order to be genuine, must be the spontaneous outgrowth and externalization of an antecedent living faith in the heart; that all union without unity to produce and support it is the sherest sham; and that, since divine things are involved, it is the worst of

shams. But then—and with this miserable "but then" they largely deny again what they have just admitted—this unity in the faith, they say, need not be so complete as to cover the whole scope of doctrine and the entire field of practice. It will be seen that a loop-hole is thus opened that is wide enough to admit the union of all Christian churches without a surrender by any of any one of its distinctive doctrines, or of its peculiarities in other respects. True, this is more than is meant to be said; but what they do mean is, that all professed Lutherans ought to unite, whether they are wholly agreed or not. They insist that the unity in the faith whereunto Lutherans in this country have already attained is all-sufficient, not only to justify, but to render obligatory upon them the formation of some sort of a body that would embrace the whole church. They thus ask for our fellowship and co-operation despite the fact we are, fundamentally even, at variance with them as regards some of the most important questions of doctrine and church-usage. What does all this signify if not an undue exaltation on their part of form above substance, of appearance over reality, of union above unity? Such at least is the interpretation which, for want of another that were at all plausible, we are constrained to put upon it. And because in our mind every endeavor at a union and fellowship in the things of God, before and without an underlying unity in them has been secured, is utterly contrary to common sense, ignores the lessons of history, is a subversion of spiritual law and is found to be in direct opposition to Scripture, therefore do we set ourselves against it heart and soul, and do we condemn the animus that runs through it as one that is not of God. That by this we do not question the honesty and conscientiousness of those engaged in the movement, need hardly be said; it is not any lack of good faith on the part of the actors, but the lack of good sense in this movement that we arraign them for. And it is with this understanding that we undertake to make a few remarks

chiefly on the practical merits of present attempts to bring about a union of Lutherans.

Organic union and co-operation in the work of the Church, though they are the legitimate fruit of oneness in the faith, yet is it not expected of this faith everywhere and always to produce them. Union and co-operation are not to the same extent divinely enjoined as is unity in the one true faith. The latter is a duty—and carries with it the pleasure and the profit of duty—everywhere and under all circumstances; not so the former, churchly consolidation and its joint enterprises are largely a question of expedience. To illustrate: that Lutherans, for example, on this side the Atlantic should, by the plain will of God, agree in the faith with Lutherans on the other side, no one will doubt; but from this it by no means follows that, in case the will of God were done as to the faith, the brethren here and the brethren there were thereupon bound to enter also into some outward association of an organic nature and for practical purposes. Such association and associate action would be wholly a matter of practicability, a question entirely of advantages and disadvantages to the Church. Taking this for granted, we go a step farther, yet nearer home, and advance the claim that what is thus true of Lutherans in Europe and America may be applicable to Lutherans within the confines of the United States. Assuming the fact—and what a happy event it would be, if it were realized—that all the synods, of our own Church had become really one in the faith and were agreed on all points of scriptural practice, even then, we maintain, would their actual union into one body be a legitimate subject for debate and nothing more. Our harmony would then put before us a problem not solid by itself, but whose solution would rest with the churches concerned and which these would be called on to work out solely upon the merits of the arguments offering themselves for or against the formation of a body on such a large scale. If, however, churchly unions

were commanded of God, then would their consummation have to follow as a matter of course wherever the required agreement in the faith has been attained. But such is not the case; for synods and combinations of synods are purely churchly devices, and therefore human institutions. There may be and no doubt there is for such associations a high degree of usefulness; as things are, they can be said to be indispensably necessary to some extent in order to carry out the work of the Church in an orderly and efficient manner; but they are not called for by any divine command or ordinance. The obligation to organize synods and to hold membership in them, strong as that may be at times and in places, is nevertheless the obligation of opportunity and expediency, and not one of any direct divine imposition. And this fact should be borne in mind, lest too much be made of such organizations and wrong be done to bring them into existence.

This same admonition is in place, moreover, with reference to the division of the Church into a number of synods, as also to the separate activity of these. Such a state of affairs may be, but it is not to be taken a priori either as in itself an evil or as the result of an evil lying back of it. True, in the case of our own Church in this land, there is too much division every way; but we are sure that the sin which Lutherans will have to account for some day lies not so much in the mutiplicity of synods as it does in the cause or causes underlying it, to wit, in the departure from the faith and from sound scriptural practice. So long as this fact is not more generally recognized and more deeply felt among us, there is no hope of a united Church. Nor does it behoove us to cherish any such hope, unless there be given us a season of repentance and a decided return on the part of our latitudinarian friends to the standard of the fathers. At present the worst feature of our troubles is that those who most loudly bewail our divisions, and who would do away with them whether or no, are so indifferent to the

doctrines and principles which are at stake; they deplore our outward divisions much more than our inner dissent, and they seem to be wholly insensible of our real sin and shame.

Indifferentism to truth is incipient infidelity; and unionists as a rule are indifferentists, at least with regard to many of the distinctive doctrines of the Church.* When this is cast up to them, not a few substantially admit it; but others will protest, appear to take offence, and tell you that, if we would but unite, all our "little differences" would soon disappear. Yes, they will say, when once we shall stand face to face and see eye to eye, it may transpire that there is little or nothing between us worth quarreling about; or if there is, it will then be an easy matter to remove it. Now it is just possible that the pleasing prospect thus held out might be realized, and with truth as the victor; but experience teaches that in most if not in all cases such alliances have proved disastrous to the cause of truth and righteousness. To show this, many cases might be offered in evidence; but, in order that nobody may feel himself hurt, we will here only call attention to the "United Church of Germany."

And indeed if men would only look more closely at the heterogeneous nature of these ventures, it might become manifest to them from the start that no good is likely to

---

* We have, for example, a large number of ministers in our Church who profess to hold the doctrine of the real presence and who know that the unworthy participation in the Lord's Supper entails upon the guilty a judgment unto condemnation; and still they persist in administering the supper to such as deny the fact of the Lord's true presence. Now, do what he may to exercise all due charity, the writer cannot thoroughly convince himself that ministers thus inconsistent in their profession and practice, are in downright earnest when they proclaim their adherence to this particular doctrine of our Church. It may be an error more of the mind than of the heart on their part; but, in either case, it is weakness in the faith evincing a lack of conscientiousness with regard to the truth.

result from them. There is in them all more or less of syncretism, and hence a compromise or at least a temporal truce of truth with error and of right with wrong. This is in itself already a surrender of sound principles, and in part of the truth itself, because it is put in jeopardy unnecessarily. What is thus begun with violence to the truth and hence in weakness can certainly not be expected to end in strength for it and in its victory. The usual result is that what was first declared to be in part a mere truce for the better interchange of views and the like, in a short time turns out to be as it would seem, a permanent state of love and peace wherein, so far as former differences are concerned, everybody is free to think and do pretty much as he pleases. For the sake of harmony a ready willingness is shown to tolerate for a while the most genuine Lutheran principles and practices—tolerate, and for a while: because the liberals feel pretty sure that in a short time there will be little of this—to them—ultra-Lutheranism left to beg toleration at their hands, though in this they are now and then sadly mistaken.

Let us assume, however, that the better element were to show fight and determine either to conquer or, if succumb they must, to die hard—what then? To be sure, in that event there would be a prospect of some good being done which might bear fruit in the future; but for the time being we would most likely have presented to the world the pitiable spectacle of a giant body with gigantic powers engaged in consuming itself in consequence of the schism among its own members. When the members of a church are at war among themselves, its general mission is neglected and all positive growth and progress are for the time being rendered impossible. This is true of the smallest congregation no less than of the largest synod; but the larger the body, the greater is the disaster. One can hardly imagine the horrors of a civil war and the damaging effects it has on the life, the morals and the several industries of a body

politic, so enormous are its dire effects. The same is true of bodies ecclesiastic whose members have their minds absorbed and distracted by the excitement of doctrinal controversy, and whose hearts are all aglow with its ominous fires. There is only this difference, that here the neglect of good is not so glaringly apparent, and the evil that is done is not so keenly felt; though in reality the casualties here are by far more appalling than they are there. True, the fact given that serious differences exist, it is far better to fight them out; and from this point of view doctrinal controversies have all the merits of a holy warfare—like thunder and lightning, they may clear the atmosphere. But be that as it may; for the general work of the church, if not for the cause of the truth, it is much better that, as far as our own Lutheran household is concerned, its present outward divisions remain as they are so long as unity in the faith between them has not been achieved. Differing as we do, the fight is on; and the former fact given, we thank God for the latter; and not the least should we thank Him for this that there is order in the battle—the order of synodical division and attack. For the sake of the faith we are contending for, let us not carry disorder into our lines, add confusion to our fight, and thus court certain disaster, as we are sure to do if we wantonly merge our opposing forces into one.

It cannot be denied that our church, in its present state of division, labors under many disadvantages, both as regards the front it ought to present against heresy and infidelity in the church and in the world at large, and as to the great work it is called to do to extend and strengthen her own borders from within. However, there is this feature about it, the importance of which cannot well be overestimated, that the separate existence of our numerous synods in almost every case is due to the assault upon some precious principle, and for that reason has a doctrinal signification. There is, moreover, in it this consolation that almost all of these bodies are strong enough to engage, each one of them

by itself, in such work as the Lord has given His Church to do; then, that there is unity and peace within the bounds of all; and lastly, that they are not seriously diverted from church-work generally by such controversies as they may have with each other as dissenting bodies, yea, that this last is quite often an incentive to greater activity on the part of each.

Thus then, whilst it cannot be denied that our unhappy divisions among other things result in a great waste of energy and render impossible some work which ought to be done and no doubt would be were we more united—for instance in the vast field of Missions, especially in heathen lands—it is after all a question whether, if churches and synods that are not agreed were to attempt to walk together, there would be any substantial gain in this respect. Of course, there would be greater display and louder noise in every way—large congregations, imposing church-edifices, prominent institutions of learning, august assemblages, well patronized magazines and periodicals, and many other things indicative of great power and big with much good. Nevertheless it is difficult to say whether upon the whole more would be accomplished by a body of such unwieldy magnitude and of so promiscuous and mixed a composition as that would be, than is now being accomplished by the synods acting separately. A comparison of the work done by such a body, for example, as the General Council with the work done by a number of independent synods equal in membership and alike situated, might throw some light on this question, and would be of great interest for some other reasons. Still, whatever the result of such inquiry and whatever the conclusions of our own speculations on the subject, we must not overlook the fact that the elements of vastness and grandeur, of power and prestige belonging to a great ecclesiastical corporation are after all human in their origin and nature, and that human energies can effect none other than human results. "What is born of the flesh, is

flesh, and what is born of the Spirit is spirit," is a law that also applies here with a slight modification. The kingdom of God is built up solely by the Spirit through the Word; and when men and their contrivances are placed into His service, there is real spiritual good accomplished and then only. Unions, therefore, in so far as they are contrived by men, however overwhelming they may be by reason of their ponderous and dazzling greatness, are in themselves no sure earnest of churchly progress.

But if a general union of our forces, such as is proposed, did give reliable promise of greater things than we are achieving now, by all means let us take into account also the element of insecurity connected with the venture. A union which in its very nature is more a scheme of the human mind than a product of the divine Spirit, as this would be, is not only a wrong in itself, but carries within its own makeup the condition of its dissolution. The eyes of honest Christian men—and many such would be drawn into the affair—may be blinded for a while, the voice of conscience hushed, and precious truths and principles be suppressed in consequence; but only for a while. In God's own good time the day of awakening is sure to come; and then the body so artfully framed and joined together is brought face to face with all the complications and dire effects of its own faulty construction. If in those days of distress it should survive, its general work must lag and much of what has been built up will then be torn down again. The Savior tells us that "a house divided against itself, shall not stand;" and every unnatural and enforced union among men is such a house. If it has given to it a life-lease for any considerable length of time, its history is sure to be the tale of a house divided against itself. Then why build such a house, and that too in the face of the Master's warning.

In the discussion of a question like this, which is so apt to arouse party prejudice, the testimony of a disinterested

witness becomes all the more valuable. This will justify us if at this place we introduce at great length the opinions of an outsider. The case he refers to and animadverts on involves the problem of our subject in many of its most striking features. If for Old and New School Presbyterians are read Old and New School Lutherans and change the tense somewhat, we may be led to think that we are reading in advance what might be the story of our own Church, were its synods mixed into one. The writer, we have reason to believe, is not only not a Presbyterian, but hardly a churchman, so that his judgment may be taken for an impartial one. In speaking of the present troubles in the Presbyterian Church he says :—

"*Compromise of Theology.* The most surprising thing about the doctrinal discussions into which the Presbyterian Church has fallen is the suddenness and unexpectedness of their precipitation. There has long been, it is true, sporadic unconcerted talk within the Church about the need of revising the creed, but there was no premonition of the present agitation in that. When the matter came up before the General Assembly last May, it was thought to have been shelved deftly by a reference to the presbyteries; at any rate, no one but the professional alarmists pretended to foresee the theological disputes which have followed. The leading Presbyterian divines and newspapers kept on with their customary complacent allusions to the doctrinal solidarity of this Church, and the security it was certain to enjoy from the theological innovations which were troubling others. It is only within three months that the Presbyterian Church has waked up to find itself almost torn in two. Such a result has really been inevitable, we can now see, ever since 1869. The reunion of the two branches of the Church effected in that year was a marriage of incompatibles. Neither old-school men nor new-school men abated their antagonistic views a particle at the time of union. They simply agreed not to fight each other openly any more. They thought

they had devised a scheme of doctrinal comprehension broad enough to reconcile opinions which in reality never can be reconciled. Men who cling blindly to the past may, indeed, agree to unite for certain ends with men who have the modern spirit, but such a union must be at the sacrifice of theological conviction and consistency, or else it must prove to be simply a patched-up truce which open war will be certain to break through as soon as an exciting cause appears.

"What is perfectly clear now, has all along been evident to the discerning—that old-school and new-school theologies were only mechanically mixed not fused. The distinctions have been steadily kept up. Certain presbyteries in the reunited Church have been zealously trained in the old-school tradition and certain others in the new. The case has been similar with theological seminaries, religious newspapers, and elective officers of the various church organizations. The unity all along has been hollow. There has been no real uniformity. Pastors are prominent and honored in New York city who would have been tried for heresy if they had been settled in Pittsburgh, and if they had ventured to preach and publish there as they have done here. If Prof. Briggs were under the jurisdiction of a Philadelphia presbytery, or were a member of the Princeton Faculty, everybody knows—for it has been frankly declared by responsible Church authorities—that this trial for heresy would have come off long ago.

"For what ends, then, was this union of theological opposites brought about, and for what ends has it thus far been maintained? Why in reality, for the sake of material prosperity? It was to make the denomination numerically stronger; to enable it to build more and more costly churches; to prevent the waste of money involved in covering the same field with two branches of the same church; to provide for a more active sectarian propaganda in the West and in New England in short, to give the Church greater prestige in the eyes of the world. That this is a

true description of the facts is shown by the tone adopted now by those who fear a dissolution of the union. They speak of the great prosperity of Zion under the united Church. They refer to the vast property-interests now at stake, and deprecate scission, not because it will unsettle faith, but because it will unsettle titles. No voice is heard to speak of any theological advantages that have accrued, of any incitement to profound investigation, of any broadening of knowledge and charity, of any real simplification or unifying of the belief of the Church at large.

"The result shows that theological compromises are as dangerous and as fruitful mothers of evil as are political compromises. It proves once again that antagonistic convictions cannot come permanently together on the basis of a mere sentiment. Let us waive our theological differences, said the men who brought about the union of 1869, and unite for practical Christian work. The Puritans know better than to believe such a thing possible. They were not very lovely, but they were very logical when they said, 'How can two walk together except they be agreed?' and carried out that principle to minute shades of theological opinion. Waiving theological differences is only another name for mental reservations, non-natural interpretations of creeds, ambiguous subscription, and all that miserable feeling of being in a false position, so much of which has been revealed in the current debates. . . .

"There is warning in all this for those who are given to the great schemes of comprehensive church union, so much in vogue to-day. . . . If theology really has any vitality, it will not long be kept down by sentiment. Sentimental union without theological union simply leads to mutual distrust, uneasy consciences, and final rupture." "*The Nation*," No. 1285.

It remains to call attention to one other objection to all such unions as are built up as doctrinal compromises and for material ends. It is the seductive, deadening and dis-

integrating effect they have on the laity of the church. Themselves born of a spirit of indifference, they in turn beget and foster the same spirit among the people. In consequence it not seldom comes to pass that the child overtops the stake and so far outruns the parent in this direction that it can be no longer controlled. Unconcern about all save the so-called common truths of Christianity, a dull moral sense, strange affiliations, wild adaptation, experimentalism, and a complete abandon to every innovation that promises to become popular—such are a few of the excesses that follow in the wake of doctrinal emancipation.

And, among other things, it is the dread of just such evils as these which causes us to deprecate the union of all Lutherans at this time. If here we be told that the evils we dread so much have in reality not set in in that part of the church which has already united on a basis of a more liberal Lutheranism, we must say that we feel ourselves constrained to receive all assurances of that sort with distrust. The result of our own observation contradicts them. True, we do not know many General Synod congregations; but among the few we do know there is not one that has anything distinctively Lutheran about it except the name.

As to the General Council, we gladly admit that there is a good deal of pure and true Lutheranism found in its midst; but we are sorry to add that, as it seems to us, its friends are in a hopeless minority. Hopeless minority, we say, because they do not take the manly stand they ought to for the truths they profess and for the right they have recognized. The Lutheranism of the Council is not of an aggressive sort by any means. There is altogether too little of discussion in that body of the subjects upon which they are at variance among themselves. The anxiety to ignore and drop their differences appears to have gotten the upper hand in the midst even of their leading men. There being so much reluctance to needful controversy, it stands to rea-

son that truth and righteousness can make no conquests; but insidious liberalism all the more.

To illustrate the workings of the leaven of unionism, take the points which to this day divide the more conservative elements of our church. It may be said that in the General Council there are, in the first place, those who believe, as we do, that secret societyism, mixed communion, pulpit fellowship, and chiliasm are contrary to Scripture, and therefore should be combated until done away with; in the second place, those who indeed hold the premises in this position well taken, but who doubt its conclusion, and therefore wish to see these evils tolerated; and, in the third place, those who deny the wrong and evil of these issues, even see some good in them, and therefore stand out for their defence. Now imagine a congregation placed in charge, in the course of time, of pastors holding views so divergent and that must lead to the most contradictory practices! First a man serves it, say, who preaches the wrong, for example, of mixed communion; then one who has doubts as to the right or wrong of it, is silent about it, and lets things take their own course; and this one is then followed by a third who holds that mixed communion is not only right but thinks it his duty to invite to Lutheran altars "anybody in good standing"—how, we ask, under such opposing ways of teaching and practice can a Christian congregation ever be led into and be grounded in the pure faith? The bewildering influences and pernicious effects upon a congregation thus dealt with must be personally witnessed and experienced in order to be understood in the full extent of their demoralizing character. And in what a sad plight must be that minister who, in his endeavors to build up a church after his own way of thinking, is met on all sides with the rejoinder: "Yes, but Bro. So and So, our former pastor, said so and did so; and we're sure that he knew what was right!" Thus is one pastor set up against another; and both of the same synod! What a

terrible condition of affairs in one and the same synod when at any time a new pastor to a congregation may mean to them a new gospel; and when with every pastoral change a change of policy and practice is foisted on them. May the good Lord keep far from us an evil so mortifying as this one must be, and from it may He deliver His Church everywhere.

Our beloved church in this land is subject to inner dissension and outward division; and it will not do for us to let things be as they are, for our dissension is a sin and our division is an evil. What shall we do? Let us follow after truth in our studies and researches; let us teach the faith we profess, the faith of our church, and let all our practice be consistent with it, however otherwise it may differ in form. And in this our pursuit of the truth and the right, let there be more of amicable discussion and less of personal wrangling. But where and how? The church-papers, especially the theological magazines of the several synods might answer the purpose tolerably well, were they read, at least by the pastors of the church; but such is not the case. For himself the writer heartily endorses the proposition to hold free conferences. In his mind nothing better could be done in order to bring about amity in the faith of our church; and when once we are one, union will come of itself. In the mean time, whilst friendly controversy is carried on between us, let there be a more dutiful regard for territorial rights and churchly discipline. The field which the Lord has given us to cultivate in this land is so large that there is ample room for all of us without any one encroaching on the ground of the other; and as to one party receiving with open arms congregations or individual members disciplined and excommunicated by another, that is a grievance so offensive in the sight of God and man that it should not once be heard of among Christians, not to say among Christians professing to hold the Lutheran faith. Ecclesiastical encroachments have done much in time past

to estrange and separate us; let a stop be put to them at once. Of course, if a congregation finds itself more in harmony with another synod than with that of its belonging let the latter dismiss it in peace if it can consistently be done; but misrepresentation, bribery, theft, connivance at wrongdoing and the like, in order to increase our congregation or synod at the expense of another should nowhere be tolerated. We can hold in the highest esteem any one who honestly differs from us in points of faith or of practice, and who acts in consistency with his position; but an unprincipled propagandist we can only have the deepest contempt for. And we hold it to be one of the first conditions of a more united church that evil doers of this sort be put away from among us wherever found. C. H. L. SCHUETTE.

THE PATH THAT LEADS TO PEACE.

By Rev. William Loehe. Translated by Rev. E. Schultz.

Why is it that among the many powerful preachers whom God of late has given to His people, while there is quite a number of live Christians, there are very few found who have penetrated to the *peace of justification?* St. John in his first letter (3, 2.) speaks with great confidence of himself and his people: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God," v. 14. "We that have passed from death unto life."—and 4, 4. he says: "Ye are of God, little children." Accordingly there is a certainty about the sonship of God, and there are men who can say of themselves that they have passed from death unto life. But why are there so few men now-a-days? Why do the most of men start when they are asked point blank to answer yes or no to the question? "Have you been born again? Are you a child of God? Are you living the life that is from God?" Why is it so seldom that upon

such questions there follows a quiet, humble, decided "Yes, you say it!" Why is there mostly a blushingly spoken "No!" a troubled "I don't know!" a fitful passionate "Yes!" which shows on the face of it, that born of the impulse of the moment, it is worse than "No!" and "I do not know!"

Why do so many hearts, especially of the young, awaken under the preaching of evangelical teachers, listen longingly and diligently, strive and do battle, so that one should think it safe to rely on their honesty, and after a few years, under changed circumstances, after their marriage, or while erecting their own hearthstone, the Christianity of their youth passes away with their rosy cheeks? Especially those promising quickened souls, the joy and crown of their teachers, are found to be like the flowers of the grass, which, not born of heaven, but sprung out of the earth, had their season, as all things in this world. Why is it that many a maturing man, many a sobered woman, looks with saddening smiles upon the awakening of their early days and protest that this awakening had been the joy of their youth, as everyone has his youthful joys, but that it was, after all, only enthusiastic imagination, like other pleasures of youth, although purer and holier? Why is it that many look down with a kind of contempt upon youthful souls glowing in their first wakening and say: "Once I also was just so, but it amounted to nothing." Perhaps various reasons can be shown for these sad manifestations of our times. I would like to submit to you for consideration especially the following. Consider, brethren, whether what I say is true.

If a soul is awakened and now inquires earnestly: "What shall I do to be saved?" the answer is given quite correctly: "Seek for Jesus and His light, Other things are useless quite." But *where* to seek Christ, concerning this, as a rule, but poor directions are given. In most cases the inquirer is advised to seek the Lord upon his *knees*, to call to Him with a longing and desiring spirit, thereupon He

will not fail to appear—in His own time, at the predetermined hour. Then the poor souls try it all; they cry; they do not let go of the Almighty until He bless them; and the Almighty, who hears the cry of the young raven, does bless them with the joyful consciousness of His presence. Full of delight does the convert arise from his knees, and believes,—believes that now he has found the Savior, his beating heart would willingly die, like Simeon, for it has seen God's salvation.—But oh! that is *transient;* to the child, to the youth in Christ, such hours are often given; the older one grows as a Christian, the less frequent one experiences such emotional joys; and if one has gauged his Christianity by these, it dwindles away; one falls into a sorrowful longing for that which is behind, and becomes a sad pillar of salt, like Lot's wife, who looked back and therefore did not reach Zoar ahead of her, the quiet place of salvation.

Many an honest servant of the Lord recognizes this danger, and therefore seeks all kinds of remedies to avoid it. He seeks to gather his sheep closely (according to Zinzendorf's often repeated advice); he admonishes them to have sympathetic intercourse with one another, forms conventicles in the congregation, calls upon his children to love one another, to warn and admonish one another, to urge one another, so that none may lose their first love; he bids one brother to pray with the other; he prescribes many rules, makes many arrangements, troubles himself day and night;—and who would blame him? It is well meant, and will not be useless, provided the gracious gifts of God in the hearts are multiplied at the same rate,—and it also has its reward promised from the Lord. But it is to be deplored that such a sympathetic intercourse can exist for any length of time only where it has become the constitutional law of the congregation, and where provision has been made to render it universal, or, because that is impossible, that the converts go only where they can find it. But this is seldom

the case,—and always remains but an outward rule, becoming useless as soon as the influx of grace ceases.

According to the common conditions of the church militant, things proceed quite differently. The Lord leads in quite different paths from those that please men. He once scattered the first congregation at Jerusalem, when it was keeping together in the greatest harmony and sympathy. He leads one hither the other thither in this world, where a true ministry and brotherly communion is seldom found, where seldom exists a gathering of such as carry and console one another, where a Christian with his cross stands alone in the desert. By this the weak heart falls into great danger. The proximity of the world, where Satan dwells, brings doubts and temptations. The boat gets into storms and breakers. The Lord, reminding them of His Word, calls to the soul: "Watch and pray?" But the soul, unaccustomed to watch alone, without brotherly companionship to stand alone in the battle, to pray without Aaron and Hur, experiences that the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak, —that its praying and sighing is too short to reach out after God's help.

However it often happens, that one has the good fortune to remain in undisturbed communion with his brethren. He does not live in the world, but the world lives in him. He must experience that even the communion of his brethren is not heaven upon earth.—He finds out that Christians also have freaks and moods to be conquered. To-day he is happy among his brethren; to-morrow, although among them, he is downcast; to-day he feasts in sympathy of love among true hearts, to-morrow he feels lonesome in the midst of the same. Among even stronger incentives to love and thankfulness than yesterday, he feels lonesome, and is to-day full of tumultuous feelings. Had he wings he would fly to the throne of Jesus; to-morrow he will wander in the desert, and God's manna will seem to him insipid food; he has fallen from peace into vexation of spirit, he has lost

his balance and does not know what to make of himself. His unstable heart, torn by the most contrary feelings, pains him sorely. He appears to himself like the lost son, as though he were a great distance from his father. The whole of his Christianity, the hours in which he was so near to God, appear to him like fanaticism. He sighs and cries, till another hour of joy comes and makes him forget his woe for a short time. Then he loses his joy again, loses it again and again, till serious doubts come concerning this continual change, till his heart, sad and under sore affliction from fear that God has forsaken him, can not contain itself any longer, and with scalding tears he seeks consolation from friends and neighbors, from teachers and ministers. These try to find how this heart is to be comforted. Their conclusion is that faith is wanting; but what the sick soul is to believe in order to be comforted in its affliction, this is not told, because he who is to tell it does not know it. Another tells it according as he knows it, and says: "Believe that God nevertheless is gracious," or something like it. But the troubled soul may ask: "Do you know it for certain that He is gracious to me? How can you prove it to me? I feel the contrary." Then the counsellor can not at once find proofs for this certainty, can not adduce sureties for this consolation. (He has them not ready in his memory, because they are not in his heart,—there is the trouble!) Or he has learned them, but can not adduce them with his own certain faith.—So the poor heart dies slowly in its grief, it can find no sure consolation, none in life, much less in death. Oh, there is need to pray:

"Holy Lord God,
Holy strong God,
Holy compassionate Savior,
Thou eternal God,
Do not let us fall
From the consolation of a true faith."

Dear brethren, this path does not lead to peace, not to that God-given certainty that nothing can henceforth part us from the love of God. This path is evidently nothing but a *path of sentiment and of works;* upon this you walk on crutches, and before you know it, the blessed gospel of the great God is changed into a self-appointed mysticism and salvation by works; and there is some truth in the designation of many of the more modern preachers and their followers as mystics. We have all fallen upon a maudlin time, that knows no pleasure but that of sentiment, and no greatness but that of works. Virtue and sentiment are watchwords of modern times. For this reason they attach to us even as Christians, yes, even in our official capacity. We consciously or unconsciously, often base our salvation upon sentiment and works (in which class institutions and associations certainly belong), although so sentimental and Roman Catholic a path is recommended neither by the holy apostles nor by the Lutheran reformers, you will vainly look for passages in their letters and writings, in which they ascribe such a power to sentiment and works (sublimely called virtue) as do preachers of to-day. What is found in psalms of this class, is partly not of such a nature, and partly is written especially to teach us how to find a path out of such sorrowful labyrinths of our souls. The reformers in their time also took an entirely different path in which to lead souls. They well knew, and fought against, the unruly sea of sentiment, but they knew how to steer directly across the open sea, yes even to walk across, instead of sneaking along the surging coast. They did not even classify the faculties of the human soul into thought, will-power and feeling. In the place of feelings or sentiment they generally put down memory. And would to God we also had left a place of greater importance for *memory* in our teachings and life, then we would probably not so soon have forgotten the once well known path that leads to peace. We generally mistake feelings for faith; whereas faith, especially if it dwells in us

in the grandeur peculiarly its own, contradicts our feelings. It is the opposite of sentiment, and, in the absence of soothing feelings, and if oppressed by sad feelings, is to be our divine, our better part, our prophet and sure promise of heaven.

If any one is awakened, should it therefore not be our first business to tell him that the excitement of his feelings and his possible joy (for not every conversion passes through strong feelings, be they bitter or sweet,) is not the permanent and grand part in it; but that he is to rejoice as though he felt no pleasure, that he is not to place so great a value upon his feelings as to have the foundation-walls of his being tremble and shake, if he did not have them. On the contrary,—and this is the principal part of our advice,—from the beginning to the end of his spiritual life he is not to look upon the changeable part in himself, but upon the unchangeable promises of the Word of God, which, thanks be to God! stand outside of us, untouched by our feelings, as a divine assurance and certification, and clear patents of safety and freedom for redeemed souls. We should represent these promises of God to newly converted Christians as even greater and more important than their faith. For faith, in the work of our salvation, is that which in man is entrusted to man, and therefore is not always constant, now weak then again strong, while the *Word of God* has stood unchanged for thousands of years. As much higher as God is than man, so much higher is God's Word and its promises than our faith. As much more as our salvation depends upon God than upon us, so much more necessary and of so much more importance is it, that God's Word should not fail, than that our faith should not fail. Our faith is little or great; God's Word is the same, now and forever. The Word of God is the truth and compassion of God manifested. The Word of God is His merciful or ireful presence,—just as you will accept it.—Where you find God's Word and His promises, there you also find God's powers of grace and life.

Now, where a soul is awakened, you must certainly give the advice: "Seek for Jesus and His light, other things are useless quite!" But you must also point to the Word of God and say: "This is it which testifies of Him!" The order must not be to *seek* upon your knees for God's revelation, but full of thanksgiving and joy upon your knees to *accept* the present revelation and manifestation of God in the Scriptures. You must show from the Word of God by simple and strong passages, who Christ is, what is His office and calling, how great is His truth. Then you must speak with the authority and confidence of a saved child of God and of an angel: "Now you know Him. He is omnipresent, especially where His Word and His sacrament is found. He loves those that do not seek Him, why not those that seek Him?—How dare you to contradict His promises on account of your stubborn and wayward heart? Do you suppose that His heart is like yours? No, no! His is full of pity and truth. You are without pity and not true to Him. He knows it. He knows you. Trust His Word, and *do not lose faith in it;* all else may perish for you, everything else may fare as it will, His promise will not fail you. In this world you have pain,—what does it matter! With Him, in His promises you have peace!"

After you have urged souls in this way, until they must surrender and accept salvation upon the word, then henceforth do not rely upon institutions, not upon our prayers and watching, and by no means upon our acts and efforts. But the same means that have made the souls acquainted with Jesus, must also keep them in His name, that is *God's Word and promises.* If one falls into temptation, doubt, feelings of any kind, you must always strictly stand by the difference between God and man, the Word of God and feelings, God's truth and human faith—and in this way again you must urge the unconditional, impassionable faith that depends on the word alone. You must fall back on the narrow path of Thomas, not to see and yet to believe. You

must praise and exalt the Keeper of Israel, who neither sleepeth nor slumbereth, who knows all sorrowing souls and their woe, and for that reason has revealed to them such glorious, touching words concerning His unalterable covenant of peace, that they, although surrounded by dogs and wild beasts, might have above them an unchangeable light for their feet, namely His promises with healing in their wings, arising like the sun, but never to set. In this way you give to the souls a resting place beyond the world, whence it can be lifted from its hinges, and its woe be changed into pure thoughts of peace. In this way you can quiet and strengthen the hearts to fight patiently the battle of life. Whoever exercises himself in this blind (but also bright) faith in the word, he will learn to understand the battle of faith. He not only casts his arms about the word, but in the word about the Lord Himself, who is called a rock; and gradually he himself assumes the nature of a rock, so that he can not be moved from his foundation nor uprooted by any calamity. You must show to the tempted souls everywhere and in all cases, that all want vanishes, all sin is forgiven, as soon as they again turn to the word of the cross with unconditional faith, and that all their woe with all its sins comes from this alone, that they again and again depart from the pure unsentimental faith and trust in God's promises.

For this purpose you must select a few clear and plain passages of Scripture for the various diseases of the spiritual life, and prayerfully apply them with simplicity for the uplifting of the tortured souls. Grand speeches of human wisdom, or God's truth clad in human wrappings are of no use here. The words of God, with the meaning of God, and these repeated and taught to the hearts, how to practice them, (for without practice there will be no glory!), will do much more than the arguments of all the world. A troubled heart will often scarcely listen even then, and must be aroused by the angelic authority of the

minister. The weak eye of faith must be raised from the dust and turned towards the words of God; it can scarcely understand God's speech adapted to the understanding of infants, much less intricate conclusions and demonstrations of human wisdom concerning eternal salvation. The strengthened heart of one dying in the Lord says: "I simply believe," and rightfully rejects all human consolation. Do not be afraid to found the salvation of men upon a few detached passages. It is useless to bid men drink in all the divine consolations and promises; the learned are just as little able to do that as the unlearned laymen. Do not fear that the spirit of temptation will teach the poor people to rely on other and contradictory passages. If, according to the apostle's injunction, the Word of God is properly divided, it will become evident that each passage is quite true and full of heavenly blessing. Put your reliance in a few passages, and repeat them. Declare often and with great earnestness that these passages are the Word of God and are of eternal duration, but that all men are liars. Do not depart from the Scriptures in any way, and do not allow the authority of any man to stand equal to it, even if he should speak correctly; that the people may look away from men, who are unreliable and pass away, and may accustom themselves to turn alone to God, and to seek consolation in His Word. If any one is assailed by doubts, do not bring forth arguments from reason to dispel them; for the doubting man does not see that doubts do not come from reason, but from lack of reason and understanding. He thinks it is reason that makes him doubt. To the doubter you must carry the Word of God, and insist firmly, that it is beyond all doubt. Such a confident faith in the minister overbears doubt, and awakens confidence where it has dropped to sleep. An unfettered faith, relying bravely upon the Word of God, rising with contempt above argument, drives doubt from the field.

If any one is in deep contrition, then proclaim the remission of sins from the Lord with divine power, and preach that absolution is greater and more powerful than all the sins of the word. If any one is in the pangs of death, then commence a prayer of thanks to Him, in whose Holy Scriptures every third word speaks of eternal life, and exalt to the dying the great certainty of the divine promises, in comparison with which even death with all his dread is a shameful liar. If any one is assaulted by Satan's cunning power, then we know what sword we are to place in his hands. If any one declares himself righteous and pure, then show him the judgment of God against all mankind in His Word, and how God's judgment destroys all human pretense. If any one is inclined to fall into sin, then show him in God's sayings His love and His threatenings, His wrath and His curse. What more can you do!

In this manner Christ fought His enemies,—the serpent and the serpent's seed,—and conquered them all—up to "it is finished!" So Luther in the name of God struck down the pope's glory and all his lies. So every one may obtain victory for himself. In word and deed, always and in all cases you must stick to the Word of God. This is the best, clearest, calmest, most conscientious Protestantism. For without the foundation of the divine Word, faith hangs suspended in mid-air, in the fog, and is a dream and product of the imagination.

This path leads to *peace.* It seems easy, but nothing is more difficult than to travel it and to teach men how to travel it. Look at the sermons of most of the preachers, what are they? Fine words, well-ordered sentences, glittering tirades, show, torture and cloud of words; but they do not understand the methods of faith, and how to ground the souls upon the word of God. Among the preachers and ministers there are a hundred mystics and preachers of good works, where one in self-denying love of God's Word desires to say nothing in all he says, but what

God says,—where one considers it his greatest honor to let the Word of God triumph over himself and his own talents, instead of placing his own gifts above God's Word and text and trying to gain glory by its defeat. If more preachers had found their peace in the Word of God, there would be fewer learned babblers in the pulpit, and beneath them more satisfied minds, that would know for a certainty in whom they believe, and would be able to affirm in suffering and death: "My Friend is mine and I am His!"

Ponder it, dear soul;—and if I am wrong, then tell it better; for it is worth our while to talk about the path that leads to peace!

Peace be with you. Amen!

INSURANCE.

AN ETHICAL STUDY.

So vast has the business of insurance in its various forms and objects become in our age, and so thoroughly has it entered into the thoughts and habits of the community, that any questioning of its propriety excites surprise and not infrequently provokes a smile. Indeed it is so securely intrenched in the public favor that some of its agents do not hesitate to appeal to men's consciences in its behalf and to represent the taking of insurance policies as a duty which men owe to their friends and their families. But that must not silence inquiry into the rectitude of the business. The writer has doubts about this, and, speaking for himself alone, presents his reasons for candid examination.

For my purpose it will not be necessary to distinguish between the different kinds of insurance societies and policies, with a view of testing them separately and in detail by the principles taught in Holy Scripture. Unquestionably some have faults from which other's are exempt. Ob-

jections more or less grave may lie against one form that are not applicable to another. The question chosen for examination is whether the principle of insurance, as applied to life and limb and property, accords with Christian morality, not whether in some of its forms, viewed in the light of mere reason, it may not be regarded as expedient, and how far, on this basis, there may be room for good judgment and refined feeling to discriminate. If the principle is right reason and sentiment must have a voice in determining the proper plan and objects and in regulating the application. Thus life insurance might be found revolting while fire insurance commended itself to the heart. Such questions would remain open for discussion if it were once decided that the principle of insurance is right. But that is for Christians the essential point, and to that I desire to direct attention.

A clear and correct statement of the question is often the principal work to be done in its elucidation and decision. But this in the case before us is by no means easy. For example, it would lead to no satisfactory result to state the question thus: Is it right, according to the Word of God, to invest money with the stipulation that, in certain contingencies, the principal with lawful interest shall be refunded? In that form some objections would be obviated from the start. But it would evade the whole question at issue. So stated we would have before us the principle of Savings Banks, only that it would be encumbered and embarrassed by the element of contingency which belongs to insurance, and in such a complication clearness would be attainable neither on the one subject nor the other. If, on the other hand, the question were stated to be, whether it is right, according to the Word of God, to hazard money in a game of chance in the hope of gains for which no equivalent has been rendered, probably all sincere Christians would be ready with an answer in the negative. But no one would be surprised if we were immediately asked, What has this

to do with insurance? Gambling institutions and insurance companies are no more identical than savings banks and insurance companies.

What is to be considered is the insurance principle, not some occasional and separable concomitants in the practice.

Having no interest in the matter but that which all Christians are presumed to have in truth and righteousness, I desire the reader to notice the distinction between a business and the accidents of its pursuit or practice. A person may sin in any calling or work. But the sin of the person engaged in a business does not render the business sinful. When a farmer trusts in his own shrewd brain and strong arm for his sustenance, he subjects himself to divine condemnation. "Thus saith the Lord, Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord." Jer. 17, 5. When a farmer relies upon the goodness of God, and does the work of his calling in the Lord's name, as a steward that must give account, he renders acceptable service and receives divine commendation. "Blessed is the man who trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is." Jer. 17, 7. The calling is in both cases the same, notwithstanding that in the one case it is pursued in sin, in the other in righteousness. Farming is not sinful because farmers sin in practicing it. The idolatrous farmer should quit his idolatry, not his farming. So in all other callings of life man will taint the work. But that decides nothing against the callings. So the insurance business cannot be condemned because sins may be committed in practicing it. A business may be right notwithstanding the wrong done by persons engaging in it. To decide whether the business is wrong requires a consideration of something more than mere accidents which attach to it.

There are occupations which are sinful in their very nature. They cannot be pursued without sin. In regard to these Christians must be admonished not only to quit the

sin attaching to the business, but to quit the business as the only possible way to quit the sin. The occupation of the harlot or the robber, for example, is in itself damnable. No one can pursue it without violating the law of God. To put away the sin is to put away the business. It would be sheer mockery in such a case to claim that the occupation is merely a means employed to gain a livelihood, while the soul puts its trust in God. To allege that God provides through such means is blasphemous. He has condemned them, and revealed His wrath against those who employ them. The business may be pecuniarily profitable and thus seem to accomplish the end of Providence in securing bread, but it is an abomination in God's sight. It is better to die, if the will of God be so, than to live by such a business.

No doubt there is in the practice of insurance companies a great deal that is not in harmony with the holy law of the Lord. Unquestionably there is a great deal of lying and deceiving to gain the public favor, a great deal of usury and theft to stave off bankruptcy, a great deal of trickery and rascality to secure wealth. Unquestionably too there is a great deal of murder and arson committed by interested parties to get insurance money. Such sins may be so frequent and the temptations to commit them may be so numerous in the insurance business as to constitute an argument against it. For whilst the abuse does not prove the use unlawful, there may be cases in which the liability to abuse warns us to dispense with things that are not indispensable. But men who think soberly will not fail to see that while such argument appeals to the individual conscience and may move a man, in the proper care for his soul, without abandoning his Christian liberty, to shun the thing that presents itself to his mind as dangerous, it does not prove the thing to be wrong. We may, in the exercise of due circumspection, forbid ourselves what God has not forbidden us and what we cannot forbid others. That sin is committed in the insurance business no more proves the

business wrong than that sinning in agricultural, mechanical and commercial pursuits proves these to be wrong. From this point of view the unwisdom of taking insurance policies might be legitimately argued, but not the unrighteousness. That is a different matter.

My doubts about the rectitude of insurance pertain to the thing itself. It would be preposterous to claim that it is as plain a case of wrong as those which have been cited as examples. If it were there would not be so many honest and sincere Christians practicing and defending it. The robber and the harlot live in violation of a plain and explicit law, and no Christians justify their sin. There is no such direct and express law in regard to insurance. If there were there would be no need for ethical studies on the subject. The relations of man to man in society are so manifold that there could be no code of laws with specifications adapted to every case in the ever-changing conditions of men. The purpose of such a code, even if it were presented, would be defeated by the minuteness and multiplicity of the regulations. But the commandments of God are very broad and sufficiently cover the conditions and relations of life to be a sure and perfect guide. It is for us to apply them, not seek to evade them. While then there is no special law which commands, Thou shalt take out no insurance policy, there are general laws which make it well worth our while to enquire whether they do not embrace such special requirement as clearly as the law, "Thou shalt not steal" embraces the special requirement not to pass counterfeit money. That application makes the difficulty, leaving large room for the differences as well in knowledge as in moral sensitiveness and the diverse results reached under their influence. Some professing Christians have no conscientious scruples to lend money at 50 per cent. interest; and if it be conceded that the divine law forbidding usury permits the taking of interest at all, it is difficult, aside from the duties imposed by civil enactments, to make it clear to them that they are vio-

lating any law of God. Some do not hesitate to sell goods at a profit of 100 per cent., and would do so, if possible, with their whole stock of merchandise without any compunctions. It is not easy to convince them that they are sinning against all righteousness and charity, and certainly it is not easy to convince them, perhaps it is questionable whether there is biblical ground for trying to convince them, that they are not Christians because they do not see or feel that they are sinning against all righteousness and charity. Such difficulties must not deter us from the persistent effort to secure general recognition for the unselfish morality of the Scriptures, and from urging on Christians the apostolic admonition. "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." Rom. 12, 1. 2. We must not pronounce sin what God does not declare to be such, but we must apply the law to our lives, and glorify God by living righteously and godly in this present world.

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house. Ex. 20, 17. Unquestionably it is wrong to violate this law. "Having food and raiment, let us be therewith content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil; which while some coveted after they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. But thou, O man of God, flee these things, and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness." 1 Tim. 6, 8–11. What the Lord our God wants of us is to serve Him with all our powers and trust His promises that He will provide for all our wants. He cares

for us, and our cares are to be cast upon Him. All that we are to be concerned about is that we do His will: He will see that we get our daily bread, and all that we have to do with that is to believe Him and in faith ask Him. What He gives us, whether it is much or little, we are thankfully to receive and conscientiously to use according to His revealed will, what He gives to others we are not to covet and we are to have no envious thoughts about. He who doeth all things well knows why it is so, and the soul that has implicit confidence in Him does not need to know or ever care to know. The more the heart is brought into harmony with the Spirit of Christ and led by the Spirit into the obedience of faith, the less is it troubled by anxious thoughts about what they shall eat or drink or wear, for which our Heavenly Father takes all needful thought. But too many "go forth and are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of this life, and bring no fruit to perfection." Luke 8, 14. The Christian as such asks nothing but what His Heavenly Father has in His Word revealed His willingness to give, and can therefore ask in faith, and wants nothing but what that Heavenly Father in His wisdom and mercy sees fit to bestow. All covetous thoughts he resists as self-conceited and rebellious impeachments of God's government.

But what has this to do with insurance? It seems to me that it has much to do with it every way.

An illustration that has been used in justification of the insurance business will answer my purpose. Two neighbors make an agreement with each other that, if the house of either is destroyed by fire, the other will indemnify him for the loss. Are they not at liberty, it is asked, to make such a contract? Is it not an honest business transaction? And that, it is claimed, is all that is done by insurance companies, only that where there are many joined together the indemnification is less of a burden to the parties. To me it seems that the neighbors are not at liberty, under God's Word, to make such a contract, and the transaction is not

justifiable in Christian ethics. In the first place, we must not covet our neighbor's property absolutely or conditionally. If our house is destroyed we must not want our neighbor's house instead, and must make no agreement that requires him in such a contingency to convey it to us. We have given him no equivalent for it and he does not justly owe it, though by an arbitrary contract he has bound himself to pay it. The prospect of getting the same amount in case the misfortune befall him is not value received for the amount to be paid, any more than the prospect of winning in a game of chance is a just equivalent for the loss incurred; and the mutual agreement to such terms no more renders the transaction lawful and right than the mutual agreement renders legitimate the winnings at the gaming table. It is coveting our neighbor's house to ask him for what by divine providence is his and not ours, though he consented to an agreement by which, under a certain contingency that is now realized, he promised to convey to us what by divine right is his and what is claimed as ours only by human contract arbitrarily made. In the second place, there is just as little right for the one neighbor to make the indemnification as there is for the other to take it. If he pleases to bind himself to restore his neighbor's property when it is unfortunately destroyed by fire, what is to hinder his execution of his own will and choice? May he not do what he pleases with his own? No! He has nothing that can be called his own in any such absolute sense. As against his neighbor he is proprietor of certain goods which God has entrusted to him; as against God he is proprietor of nothing, but simply a steward who must give account to the Master. He cannot rightfully do what he pleases with the Lord's goods. His only right is to do his Master's will. But is it the will of that Master that any of His servants should pledge himself, in a certain contingency, to give his neighbor a house, though in justice he does not owe it and in charity he may not be able to give it

because that neighbor is not in need while other neighbors are? The Lord's command is: "Let him that stole steal no more, but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing that is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." Eph. 4, 28. "As we have opportunity let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." Gal. 6, 10. It is not right to make a contract by which I may be bound to pay what according to God's ordering I do not owe, and thus to prevent the use of my goods in supplying the wants of the needy as in God's providence the opportunity is presented; and it is not charity to bind myself to help another in case of his suffering a loss without knowing whether, if such contingency occurs, God has not enabled him to help himself better than hundreds around me who are really in need. The fact that the other has pledged himself to do the like by me if the loss be mine, while it furnishes no basis for a legitimate business transaction, precludes all thought of charity.

The illustration does not remove my difficulty, but only confirms my scruples. I cannot reconcile the insurance business with faith or justice or charity. It seems to me to contravene them all.

If the plan of insurance be that of the mutual companies, some objections fall away; but the main points which awaken doubts and scruples in my mind still remain. In all cases the receipt of an amount under certain contingencies is stipulated that is, out of all proportion to the sum invested or the service rendered. What is to be received is not even claimed, in the ordinary practice of insurance, to be merely a just remuneration for labor performed or a fair profit on capital invested. The money that falls to the insured in case of fire or death is not earned by the recipient in a calling which God has given and in which he is to serve his God and his neighbor. He has not earned it at all, and could not claim it as his due, except for an arbitrary contract creating a factitious obligation. There

are few who have the courage to contend that insurance is one of God's ways of bestowing or preserving property, and that taking out insurance policies is a consequent duty which must be performed in order to do His will and claim His promise of daily bread. I trust that at least no reader of the *Magazine* thinks the words of the apostle, "This we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat," (2 Thess. 3, 10), is to be applied to those who will not avail themselves of the insurance business to increase their property or protect them against its decrease by accident or, I beg leave to add, by visitations of Providence. This much Christians must at least see, that God can provide for us without insurance companies and that He does not require us to resort to them for security against want. The business lies wholly outside of God's appointments.

That relegates it seemingly to the sphere of Christian liberty. About that there are several things to be said that seem to me to be generally overlooked. One is that while there are some things morally indifferent, because God has given us no command in regard to them, one way or the other, no person can be morally indifferent, even when he deals with these indifferent matters. He has Christian liberty, and will not be subject to any yoke of bondage which men may endeavor to lay upon him in these indifferent matters. Christians are servants of God alone, and therefore can never consent to submit to the usurpations of men. But Christians are always servants of God, and do not cease to be so when they act in the domain of liberty. The divine rule is: "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." 1 Cor. 10, 31. "Whatsoever ye do, in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by Him." Col. 3, 17. There are things in regard to which the children of God may exercise their judgment and choice, doing one thing or doing another, according as seems to them wisest and best; but whatever they decide to do must

be in the name of their Lord and must in their judgment redound to God's glory. They are not free to serve the flesh in anything; they are to walk in the Spirit even when they make a choice between two or more things in regard to which God has given no command in His Word and which are therefore left to the free choice of believers. But it is of the highest importance to observe that it is only believers who have this liberty. Others are under bondage, and all their claim of liberty is a delusion. Personally there is nothing morally indifferent to a Christian, because as such he is a servant of God who does all in His Redeemer's name and in all things seeks His glory. Another thing that is but too often overlooked follows from this; namely, that the indifferent always lies in the domain of the good as against the evil. There is no liberty to do wrong. The believer has just as little freedom in that regard as the unbeliever. The grace of God which makes him a believer in Christ Jesus at the same time creates in him a new heart which hates sin and loves righteousness. "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." 1 John 5, 18. Whoever claims the liberty to do right or wrong as it may please him, by that very claim makes manifest that his heart is not right before God. Only the righteous are free, and only in the sphere of righteousness is there any liberty of choice. We may choose between one way of exercising charity or another way, but whether we shall exercise charity is not a matter of choice; we may select between one action or plan to promote God's glory or carry on God's work on earth or another, but whether we shall promote His glory or execute His will is not left to our discretion. We may rightfully choose between two ways that are both good, but not between good and evil; we may choose between doing or not doing a work that is neither commanded nor forbidden, but such a work cannot be bad, else it would be forbidden, though it may be good without being specifically

commanded, as the will of God may be accomplished also by another work in His service.

Such a matter of mere expediency, in which the Christian has to decide whether the way or work proposed is the best among various ways to serve God and promote His glory, I have thus far not been able to regard the way and work of insurance. Christians have large scope for the exercise of judgment and choice in the fulfilment of their earthly callings. They may choose the business in which they think they can best serve God and their neighbor; they may choose the way in which they regard themselves able best to use their strength and means in the fulfilment of their vocation: but the whole field of the temporal calling is not on that account outside of the realm of righteousness and duty. A man has no more right to do as he pleases in business than he has in worship. In all cases, everywhere and always, he is to serve God, and can be free only while he continues in that service. His earthly as well as his heavenly calling is of God, and he must faithfully do God's work in it, as one that must give account, and trust God's providence for the supply of his daily bread. He is not to devise ways of getting wealth and keeping it; he has simply to do his duty, and thankfully take and conscientiously take care of and use what God, who alone provides, is pleased to give. When he arranges, under any circumstances or any contingency, to increase his possessions or cover his losses by getting his neighbor's goods without paying for them, he violates the law of God that forbids him to covet his neighbor's house.

It is argued, indeed, that getting the money in prospect under the conditions agreed upon is not necessarily the motive for obtaining an insurance policy; that generally it would be preferred if the contingency in which alone it is expected, would not arise; and that a person may as justly be assumed to be actuated in seeking insurance by a charitable purpose to aid others in case of misfortune as by a selfish

desire to get money for one's family or to be secure against losses.

Conceding that a man does not wish to die that his family may obtain the amount of his life insurance, it is still evident that his expectation that they will get it when he does die, though he has rendered no equivalent for it, is one of the motives, if not the only motive, that impel him to seek insurance. I do not wish to enter upon incidental considerations that are involved in the question, such as the temptation to suicide and murder in order to get the money, and the peculation and usury in order to be able to pay it. I prefer to confine myself to the main point of principle involved. Life insurance companies could not exist for a day if the motive of getting money for which no equivalent was rendered were removed, and nothing remained as an inducement but the charitable desire to help those who are bereaved by the death of the insured.

Conceding also that a man does not wish his property to be destroyed by fire in order that he may get his insurance money—although the history of crime has many a dark tale to tell in this regard—he still wants the money and is moved to seek insurance by the desire to get it, though he knows that he gets that for which there was no value received by those from whom he claims it. Those engaged in the insurance business only laugh at the idea of conducting it as a scheme of charity and of endeavoring to induce men to insure their property with a view of helping those who may suffer loss by fire or flood. They know that if self-interest does not render their appeal successful, it is in vain to appeal to them on other grounds.

But it is replied that when Christian people insure their property it is not even just, much less charitable, to assume that they lay aside all motives of benevolence and act from pure selfishness. Why may we not assume that they see in an insurance policy a positive benefit to those who are unfortunate, and that, while they would avail themselves of it,

they are heartily desirous that others, in case the misfortune befalls them, should be recipients of this benefit? To this I have a twofold reply.

In the first place, it does not lie in the design of God that we shall suffer no loss in earthly goods, and it is therefore not in accordance with His will and government that men should lay and execute plans by which such losses are compensated. It is not necessary here to enter upon the intricate questions of providential dispensations in their relation to Satan's malice and man's folly. Christians do not doubt that God uses tribulations also, whatever may be their source, for His purposes, and that He makes all things work together for good to them that love Him. If a Christian's house burns down, he has no good ground to say that this loss is a pure evil, and that any plan by which the accident is rendered ineffectual to diminish his earthly possessions must be good. In the purpose of God a great blessing may lie in such a loss. Least of all should we think of covering such loss and depriving ourselves of such blessing by demanding the amount at the hands of those who of right do not owe it, though by contract they have bound themselves to pay it. It is a dangerous thing to devise schemes in order to escape the trials by which God would prove us and purify us.

In the second place, it is not in accord with Christian charity to give, as it is not in accord with Christian rectitude to take, in the way stipulated by insurance companies. As we cannot with a good conscience claim or accept, or enter into a contract that would give us the semblance of a right to claim or accept, that from our neighbor which he does not offer as a free gift and for which we have rendered no equivalent, so we cannot with a good conscience pay, or bind ourselves in certain contingencies to pay to our neighbor that for which he has rendered us no equivalent and which of right we therefore do not owe. To say that we only pledge ourselves to practice Christian charity to par-

ticular persons in case they should be unfortunate, and thus only specially obligate ourselves to do what as Christians we are bound to do at any rate, is a sophism by which no Christian should permit himself to be misled. For, first, no man has a right to enter into a contract to help these particular persons in preference to others and thus to place a limitation upon the divine law requiring us to give to him that needeth. According to the Scriptures not members of an insurance company, but members of the body of Christ are those who should receive attention first. "As we have opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." Gal. 6, 10. Secondly, those who are recipients of the gift in insurance companies, are often such as are not in need of help, and cannot therefore be objects of Christian charity. If a rich man's house burns down it is absurd to claim that the poor are bound in charity to assist in restoring his property and bringing his wealth up to its previous standard. And, thirdly, charity suffers no dictation as to the amount to be paid, and never asks the same of rich and poor alike, or gives the same to rich and poor alike, but always gives to him that needeth and according as the Lord hath prospered.

The practice of insurance is therefore as little to be placed under the category of charity as under that of work in one's calling. Its proper place is among the various games of chance. While it does not, so far as fire insurance is concerned, aim at increasing property at others' expense, it does in all its forms take what belongs to our neighbor without giving him an equivalent. Whether it is obtained to increase or to prevent a decrease of our possessions, is a matter of indifference so far as the morality of the matter is concerned; and that all parties consent in view of the possible advantage to be gained, no more makes the wrong right than when the gambler, looking to the possible gain, consents to suffer the loss.

I cannot reconcile the insurance scheme with the righteousness that God requires, because it makes a contract which binds the parties to pay what is not a just debt on the ground of value received, and because the contingency on which the whole calculation is made and upon which the whole business turns is not a legitimate article of trade. That which would justify this would, as it seems to my mind, justify any game of chance. I cannot reconcile it with faith, because when the soul is once fully assured that our heavenly Father cares for us and provides for us, and that we only sin by our anxious care for the morrow's bread, as if God were forgetting us or were unable to supply our wants, there will in the nature of the case be no resort to such expedients to secure more than God gives through the ordinary channel of our vocation and work, as to erect a barrier against any possible diminution of our property, though such diminution should take place under the guidance of God's providence for the good of His children. If God alone provides and supplies us with all we need, and therefore asks us to trust His providence and pray to Him for our daily bread, what need could I have for such human expedients which lie outside of the work of my calling, are not in the line of the ordinary ways of Providence, and only form a temptation to put my trust in the good providence of man? If it is really so that God provides, there is nothing for us to do but the duty which He lays upon us and then to trust His goodness. This I hold to be the meaning of our Savior's words: "Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek;) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Matt. 6, 31–33. We have no reason and no right to believe that God means to provide for us through insurance companies, and any prayer

in that regard would be a prayer of doubt that has no promise. Neither can I reconcile the way of insurance companies with Christian charity, which asks no help and gives no help where there is no need, which makes no discrimination between those who pay and those who do not pay when help is to be afforded, and which refuses all dictation as to how much shall be given. Charity will not be bound beforehand to give a certain amount to certain persons under certain contingencies. If a neighbor's house burns down, we may in charity be required to help him. But that is not determined by the mere fact that his house has burned down. He may have more property than his neighbors for all that, and be less in need of help than most of them. The help given him in charity would only be an uncharitable withholding of so much from "him that needeth." On no ground and in no way does the principle of insurance seem to me to harmonize with the teachings of God's Word.

The writer does not hold that the wrong of insurance is of such a nature as to call for church discipline, and hopes that no one will be deterred by fears of the consequences from a candid examination of the subject in the light of God's Word. It is not a gross and scandalous sin that must needs be manifest to every sincere believer. Men may differ about it without disturbing their fraternal relations. But he does believe that the world that lieth in wickedness is gradually enlarging its influence in the church and substituting its selfish and sinful views and practices for the right ways of the Lord, and that many a soul is led to ruin by lack of instruction and guidance and warning in regard to the "cares and riches and pleasures of this life." Pastors need not think of exercising church discipline whenever they see a wrong in the community that is encroaching upon their congregations, but they should be prompted to teach the people what the will of the Lord is in regard to business and money and daily bread, and to apply their teaching in their pastoral care of individual souls. There should be

more trust in God and His ways, and less reliance upon man and his devices. These devices but too often are based on the assumption, though in many cases it be unconsciously, that God's providence may fail us in the day of trouble, and but too often tend to defeat the purposes of that providence. Let Christians trust in God and do their work: the Lord will provide. M. Loy.

OUR LORD'S HUMILIATION.

Our old dogmaticians, whose masterly exposition of the doctrine of Christ's person deserves more general recognition than modern theologians are willing to accord it, treat at considerable length of our Lord's humiliation. To them it is a locus of importance for the right apprehension of our blessed Savior's person and work, as it must be to all who look into the great mystery of godliness which is revealed for our salvation in Holy Scripture.

The words to which principal reference is made in setting forth the subject are those of St. Paul: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and, being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Phil. 2, 5–8. What the Lutheran Church, in her humble acceptance of the Holy Spirit's teaching sees in these words is expressed by Baier when he defines the doctrine as follows: "The state of humiliation consists in this, that Christ for a time renounced, truly and really, yet freely, the plenary exercise of the divine majesty, which his human nature had acquired in the personal union, and, as a lowly man, endured what was far beneath the divine majesty, that He might suffer and die for the life of the world."

In order to be convinced that the Church has rightly understood the apostle it is necessary, first of all, to secure certainly as to the subject concerning whom the statements in the passages cited from St. Paul are made. "Let the same mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." Of Him it is then predicated that He, though He was in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation, took on Him the form of a servant, humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death. Nothing is plainer than that all this is said of Christ Jesus. But that does not settle everything. Christ Jesus is God and man in one person. The Son of God that was made flesh and dwelt among us, and whose name was called Jesus when He was born of the Virgin Mary, was begotten of the Father from eternity. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." John 1, 1. He existed before the fulness of time was come when He was manifest in the flesh. Even from everlasting to everasting He is God. A distinction must therefore be made between the Word before and after the incarnation, and between the two natures in the incarnate Word. Does the apostle speak of the Eternal Son of God before He was made flesh, as of the Lord Jesus who dwelt among us as God and man, and are the things predicated of Him to be referred to the divine or to the human nature? The declaration that He "being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation and took upon Him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men," leads some interpreters to regard the apostle as speaking of the Word before the incarnation and as asserting that the Eternal Son of God "made Himself of no reputation," or, as the original expresses it, emptied Himself, by becoming incarnate and appearing in the likeness of men. The Lutheran Church has not so understood it. And she is right. The grammar and the context of the passage, and the analogy of faith, are all against it. The apostle is not

speaking of the incarnation of the Word, but of the humiliation of the Word made flesh, "made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." For maintaining this with our old theologians, who loved the Word of God and studied it with care, it is meet that we offer a reason.

In the first place, the person spoken of is Christ Jesus. It was He that made Himself of no reputation, or emptied Himself. That gives us light in regard to the subject of the predicates. Christ Jesus is not the name of the Word, or the Eternal Son of God, prior to His incarnation and independently of this great event that took place in the fulness of time. The angel said to Mary, "Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bring forth a Son, and shalt call His name Jesus." Luke 2, 31. "She shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus; for He shall save His people from their sins." Matt. 1, 21. "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Acts 2, 36. This person who is the Anointed of the Lord and the Savior of the world is indeed the same who was in the beginning with God and by whom all things were made, and therefore there is no warrant for contending that it would be impossible to apply the names Christ and Jesus to the Word before His incarnation; but there is manifest warrant for contending that, in the absence of any proof to the contrary, the words must be taken in their usual sense and application. The names mentioned by the apostle are those which indicate the holy Child who was born of the Virgin to save His people from their sins, the Word made flesh, "the man Christ Jesus." There is no reason why we should attach an unusual sense to the apostolic designation. He who is spoken of is the incarnate Lord, "Jesus Christ, true God begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary," who redeemed us with His precious blood.

In the second place, the context is such as to preclude the thought of a reference to the Word prior to His being made flesh and to the incarnation as the act presented for consideration. The apostle admonishes the Philippians to unity and love and harmony and peace, and to this end charges them to lay aside wrangling and to cultivate holiness and humility, that they may not in selfishness look merely to themselves, but in charity be concerned for the welfare of the brethren. Of such humble self-sacrifice he sets before them our Lord as an example, and exhorts them to have the same mind which was also in Him, who, though He could have claimed divine honor and glory, chose rather for our sakes to lay aside these high prerogatives and live like other men in the infirmity and servitude which are the consequence of sin's entrance into this otherwise happy world, nay, even to suffer the humiliation of a painful and ignominious, though unmerited death on the cross. Is there in this exhortation to humility from the example of our blessed Lord any ground for assuming that the apostle was thinking of the Eternal Son of God, the Creator and Judge of us all, as illustrating by His becoming incarnate the lowliness which He requires of His creatures and subjects? There was incomprehensible condescension in that act, unquestionably. Our dogmaticians saw and appreciated that, and therefore were accustomed to mention it as in a certain sense a humiliation. But it is only by a figure of speech that the word can be applied to this ineffable display of divine love. The Lord of all the earth does not subject Himself to His creatures, as these creatures are required to subject themselves to one another at the Lord's command and for the Lord's sake. The incarnation is an example for no man: it stands far above all human thought and all human imitation. But the Lord God Almighty who loved us beyond all our power of imagination or speech, and clothed Himself in human flesh for our deliverance from death and destruction, when He had become incarnate and thus appeared on earth

as one of our race, did set us an example which we could and should imitate. This man Christ Jesus was God over all, blessed forever, who might have asserted His prerogatives even as a man, seeing that His humanity was in personal union with the Divinity and thus partaker of divine attributes, and yet, though he was in the form of God, that is, though He was possessed of all divine powers and entitled to all divine honors even in His human nature, He renounced everything, walked and worked and suffered like other men, and even subjected Himself to the dreadful and shameful death of the cross. That is the example which the apostle sets before us for imitation. The whole context shows that the apostle is speaking of the incarnate person whom the name indicates, "the man Christ Jesus," who, by reason of the personal union with the Eternal Son, was in the form of God, but who notwithstanding made Himself of no reputation and humbled Himself to secure our salvation.

In the third place, the teaching of Scripture concerning the unchangeableness of God forbids the assumption that the Eternal Son of the Father laid aside His Godhead by becoming incarnate, or become anything less than God by assuming our human nature into the unity of His person. He cannot emty Himself of His Divinity, or renounce the attributes which are essential to His Divinity. "Of old hast Thou laid the foundation of the earth," says the psalmist, "and the heavens are the work of Thy hands. They shall perish, but Thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt Thou change them, and they shall be changed: but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall have no end." Ps. 102, 25–27. He is that He is, the perfect Being in whom any change would be a diminution of His perfection and a dimming of His glory. Therefore any doctrine which asserts or implies that the Word laid aside any of the attributes which He had

from the beginning as the Only Begotten of the Father, conflicts with the Scriptures and dishonors God. The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, but He did not by this act of infinite mercy cease to be the Word that was God and by whom all things were made. He always was, is now, and always will be "God over all, blessed for ever." The Deity never emptied Himself of His divine perfections and made Himself of no reputation. He could not be unchangeably the same amid all the changes of the earth which He created, if such a change took place in the Lord of all. What is said of the self-renunciation and humiliation can, according to the revelation given in the Bible of God's being and attributes, refer only to the human nature of Christ and therefore to the time subsequent to His incarnation.

In the fourth place, the inspired record shows that the Son of God, when He had become incarnate, had not emptied Himself of His divine attributes. He says, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," and "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Matt. 28, 20; 18, 20. He had therefore not laid aside His omnipresence. He "needed not that any should testify of man; for He knew what was in man." John 2, 25. He had therefore not laid aside His omniscience. He performed miracles manifesting His almighty power and divine glory, as when He healed the sick and raised the dead, and therefore had not stripped Himself of His omnipotence. He said after His incarnation, "I and my Father are one," "making Himself equal with God." John 10, 30; 5, 18. It is preposterous, in view of such testimony of the Holy Spirit, to maintain that when He became incarnate the Son of God emptied Himself of His divine power and majesty, and that the humiliation of our Lord consisted in the exchange of the divine perfection for human impotency. He was the Lord from heaven, to whom honor and glory belonged, and none of

His divine perfections were lost by His appearance on earth to save the lost. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." John 1, 14. The Eternal Word was so far from being shorn of His majesty by being made flesh that His power and glory were communicated to the human nature which was assumed into the unity of His person; and in regard to this human nature, thus in possession of divine attributes by communication, He made Himself of no reputation, took on Himself the form of a servant, and humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Only the fact that the Son of God retained all His power and majesty made such a communication and consequent humiliation possible without detriment to the Divinity.

In the fifth place, the self-abnegation and humiliation of which the apostle speaks is followed by a corresponding exaltation, and could therefore not consist in the incarnation itself; for if Christ Jesus made Himself of no reputation and humbled Himself by assuming our nature, He was exalted by again laying aside our nature. The subject of the humiliation and exaltation is the same. If that subject is the Word, and what in the verses treating of His humiliation is predicated of Him is that He emptied Himself of His divine attributes by becoming incarnate, then in the verses treating of His exaltation what is predicated of Him is that He was again exalted by the removal of the human nature, through the assumption of which He emptied Himself or made Himself of no reputation. The humiliation then consisted in putting on humanity, and the exaltation in putting off humanity. Thus the reality of the incarnation is done away, and the glorious, fundamental part of Christianity, that the Word was made flesh for our salvation, is reduced to a theophany or mere appearance of the Son of God in human form without the human essence. And that not only contradicts the Scriptures which tell us

that "there is one God and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 2, 5), who was "not a High Priest which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4, 15), but it destroys the very foundation of our faith and hope and comfort by rendering the sacrifice upon the cross for man's redemption all unreal. The Word of God teaches far otherwise. It sets forth the incarnation as a real assumption of our human nature into the unity of the person of the Son of God, that Christ might really live and suffer and die for the sins of the world as our Substitute. That human nature He has not laid aside. He is exalted to the right hand of God, but not by putting off His humanity. It is our Brother that is exalted. "As the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily He took not on Him the nature of angels, but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Heb. 2, 14–17. The Word became really incarnate, as it was needful to accomplish the purpose of divine love in regard to a fallen world, not laying aside His divine attributes, but communicating them to the human nature, which in the incarnation became part of His glorious person, but in that human nature making Himself of no reputation, that He might suffer privation, scorn, and death for the salvation of sinners.

The subject of the humiliation is Christ Jesus, the incarnate Word. He is true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary. As true God nothing can be added to His per-

fection, and nothing can be taken away. As such He never made Himself of no reputation and never humbled Himself. How could God ever be lower than God, or abdicate His throne, or resign His majesty and glory? It is Christ Jesus, the Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who was at the same time God over all, blessed for ever, of whom the apostle is speaking and of whom he says such wonderful and precious things for our learning and our comfort.

Our Lord, as to His human nature, was in the form of God, but thought it not robbery to be equal with God. The Son of God took on Himself our nature. He was still the same person after the incarnation as before. But the humanity was really assumed, and the person who was God from everlasting to everlasting was now God and man. Great is the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh to save our lost souls. The humanity became really and truly one in person with the divinity, though the divine nature remained divine and the human nature remained human. But the divine attributes which belonged to the person were in virtue of this union communicated to the human nature, which also belonged to the person. Christ was therefore also in His human nature "in the form of God", having divine attributes and powers by communication, although essentially this nature was truly human and aside from such communication had only human attributes. In this "form of God" He might have lived on earth as man, exercising the powers which had been given the human nature by its union with the divine in one person, and receiving the honor which was justly His due. But then there would have been no Gethsemane and no Calvary. Then they could not have crucified the Lord of glory, and there would have been no atonement made. Therefore "He thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation." All power was given unto Him in heaven and upon earth, not as regards His divine

nature, which had all power from eternity, but according to His human nature, which received it through its union with the divine in the one undivided person; but He did not choose to make a display of the divine attributes and powers that were given Him, as the victor displays His booty and receives His reward of praise. He did not use it as a prize that had been taken and was now to be shown in triumph. On the contrary, His good and gracious will was to keep His divine power in abeyance that He might fulfill His mission on earth. Therefore He who as to His human nature was in the form of God took upon Him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men. The man Christ Jesus did not walk in majesty and power on earth like God, though all power was given to Him, but lived and labored and suffered like other men. The divine power and majesty were His, but He voluntarily laid aside their use, except on extraordinary occasions, and subjected Himself to the wants and weaknesses and woes of mankind, so far as these were not sinful. And not only did He who, according to His humanity also, because of the communication to this of divine attributes in its personal union with the Eternal Son of God, was in possession of divine power and entitled to divine honor, choose to appear like ordinary human beings, but He took upon Him the form of a servant. "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." Matt. 20, 28. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich." 2 Cor. 8, 9. Sometimes, indeed, He "manifested forth His glory," and men beheld it and marveled; but ordinarily He appeared as a servant ministering to the sinful race whom He came to save from the curse of sin. Nor is this all that the apostle has to say of this mystery. Our Lord did more. "Being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the

cross." In addition to all, the servant was willing to die for the sins of the world, and that the most ignominious of deaths, humbling Himself to the last and to the uttermost. He was not subject to death, which is the wages of sin, except as He voluntarily chose to take our place and pay the penalty of sin. "Therefore doth my Father love me," He says, "because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." John 10, 17. 18. That power He exercised in the infinite love wherewith He loved us. "He is despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; and we hid our faces as it were from Him. He was dispised, and we esteemed Him not." Isa. 53, 3. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Gal. 3, 13. He was willing not only to be a servant, but also to bear cruel mockery and scorn, and to finish His gracious work by suffering Himself to be nailed to the accursed tree, in agony and shame atoning for the sins of the world.

The import of St. Paul's words may therefore be briefly stated thus: Our blessed Lord was, according to His human nature also, possessed of divine attributes, but did not wish to make a show of them; without laying aside those attributes which were given to Him as man, He ordinarily refrained from their use, but was willing rather to assume the form of a servant and appear in the likeness of men; and even as a servant He humbled Himself by suffering pain and shame and death, even the death of the cross.

Why there was such a self-renunciation with regard to His human nature, not by any means with regard to His divinity, is not left unexplained. He came as the Lamb of God to take away the sins of the world. The second person of the glorious Trinity renounced nothing, but as-

sumed our human nature into the unity of His person. The assumed humanity thus received divine power, over against which all the power of Christ's foes was very impotency. He could have crushed them with a single word. But He loved us unto death, and would not use His power to escape the penalty of our sin, from which He came to deliver us. He made Himself of no reputation, and took on Him the form of a servant, and humbled Himself even to the death of the cross, that we might not perish, but have everlasting life. He hath done abundantly above all that we could ask or think to deliver our souls from the impending doom. "God commendeth His love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Rom. 5, 8.

"Therefore we hold and teach, with the ancient orthodox Church, as it explained this doctrine from the Scriptures, that the human nature in Christ has received this majesty according to the manner of the personal union, viz: because the entire fulness of the divinity dwells in Christ, not as in other holy men or angels, but bodily, as in its own body, so that with all its majesty, power, glory, and efficacy in the assumed human nature, voluntarily when and as He wills, it shines forth, and in, with, and through the same manifests, exercises, and executes its divine power, glory, and efficacy, as the soul does in the body and fire in glowing iron. For by this illustration, as is also mentioned above, the entire ancient Church explained this doctrine. At the time of the humiliation this majesty was concealed and withheld for the greater part; but now since the form of a servant has been laid aside, it fully, powerfully, and publicly is exercised in heaven and on earth before all saints, and in the life to come we will also behold this His glory face to face. John 17, 24." Form. Conc. 2. 8, 64. 65.

M. Loy.

MISSION WORK IN THE FAR WEST.

The temporal advantages offered by the far west to the people of all nations have attracted attention and they have been sending forth a steady stream of immigrants which constitutes a large portion of the population. Here are free lands, a wealth of soil, timber and minerals, a salubrious climate. The possibility of amassing if not a fortune, yet a competence, is in excess of what older countries offer, and the heart of man, bent on this world's goods, is easily allured away from his native soil to adopt one more lavish. A large proportion of this foreign element is European, and of this again the majority is Protestant. The term "Protestant" in European lands is synonymous with Lutherans. The Lutheran Church finds the mission field in the far west making demands upon her. Her statistics show that it is anything else rather than a barren field and that her labor in the Lord has not been in vain.

While the field is inviting, it is not without its serious obstacles. Among these may be mentioned the materialistic disposition of the people. It must be conceded that what brings probably the majority of these people here is the avowed purpose of getting rich, and to get rich as quickly as possible. While men love money the world over, this affection for lucre is nearer the surface at some places than at others. This desire for speedy enrichment frequently sanctions unhallowed means. People are determined to get rich at all hazards. To add fuel to the flame there comes what has grown to be almost a science, and what has fitly been denominated "booming". Men are enriched as a bait; or if it be honestly, it has come like an avalanche. There follows in the wake of a new railroad a host of towns and cities. Property is enhanced in value. A few children of fortune are made wealthy and the whole neighborhood is set ablaze. This booming spirit has made the population very

nomadic. There is an endless number of people who have spent the best years of their life in following up booms. As soon as it subsided at one place they hastened off to another, hoping to get in on the "ground floor"; and more or less the whole population is playing at a game of chance. The staple of conversation is real estate. The mind of man is small; and when it is so thoroughly filled with this world there is correspondingly little room for the next. Society pays its deepest homage to the "Golden Calf", and it receives much of the honor which belongs to the true God.

Another great and for many years to come an insuperable object is the scarcity of suitable men to prosecute the work. By suitable men we understand such as, in addition to the spiritual gifts and requirements of the profession, have the full use of at least two languages, one of which shall be the English. The population is more conglomerate than in the eastern states; and the transition to English, in the country and smaller towns, will be rapid because, unlike many eastern states, the commonwealth offers no instruction in other than the English language. It is safe to say that a majority of the people have lived in the eastern states long enough to acquire a business use of the English. A minority, a small one at that, comes directly to this coast from foreign shores. The transition to English has progressed far beyond what it is in some of the states bordering on the Mississippi river. In addition, the polyglot character of the Lutherans makes it necessary that for full efficiency and results there be the equipment of the English language. A case at hand will illustrate this. Recently we visited a healthy village near Tacoma. We found Lutherans enough to start an encouraging work; but at the outset we found what at first seemed to be an impassable gulf. It was the language question. The people found, claiming to be Lutherans, spoke five different languages: English, German, Norwegian, Danish, Swedish. There was but a handful of each. The location of the village is such that it never can make a place

so large that each nationality could have preaching in their own tongue. And if in the course of years enough of one tongue should gather together there to have their own church, the majority would be cold and lost to the work. We calculated thus: "One-fifth of these people will understand a German service; nine-tenths of them an English one." The way seemed open to us. We preached English, addressing a few words to the Germans at the close. The people themselves saw the problem in the right light, and the representatives of five nations resolved to adopt a new language together with a new country, and the work bids fair to prosper beyond our expectations.

Herein we think lies a great lesson for the Lutheran Church of America in general and the Joint Synod of Ohio in particular. There are many places where a congregation of each tongue can flourish as we see them doing in Tacoma, Seattle, Portland and San Francisco; but there is an endless number of places where the representatives of each language can never be sufficiently abundant to organize separate churches, but where nine-tenths of them could be united by means of the English language. We propound the question: Has the General Council not looked this matter over more fully and diagnosed the case more correctly than our own Synod? For our part we think it has.

Whether the above will find the approval of the majority of the brethren or not, so much is certain, that we must insist upon it that only such men can be sent out as traveling missionaries. Men of one tongue can be stationed at a place and do well, but from a business point of view they are a failure as traveling missionaries. In almost every town of energy a man of tact can get a few lots donated for church purposes. He can get financial assistance. Men want churches and schools, if for no good purpose, then for business purposes; it helps the "boom." Men who are acquainted with the customs and language of this country are the only ones who can be eminently successful as traveling

missionaries. Let it be a rule, once for all, that such advance agents of our work be selected as much for their business energy and capacity as for their piety. A good man could secure lots and make an opening for a regular pastor just once a month; and in some cases he could even erect the church. The history of our Synod on this coast will, with a single exception, not bear reading in this respect. We might learn from the denominations around us. They have secured property, now worth millions, for the mere asking and knowing how to ask; and we are now following them and paying the cool cash. We have been penny wise and pound foolish. A good man well salaried would return to the mission work just ten times his salary every year. Let us commend at least this point to our Mission Board.

The scattering of our brethren and the proselyting resulting therefrom are grave hindrances to success. The missionary who is on the alert will strike for the centers; for in this way only can he hope to accomplish something rapidly and establish work whose influence will radiate throughout the surrounding country. The best fields numerically are usually chosen first, and as a consequence places with but a few families are left unsupplied. One enters no village or hamlet, one travels no distance through the country without finding Lutherans; but at some places so few that the missionary cannot think of spending time and labor there. After a few years such people have either grown indifferent or have fallen a prey to the sects. And that this latter may be the case pastors speaking the language of the people are sent among them. One can scarcely approximate the thousands of souls being lost to our church annually in this way. The statistics of our church show a rapid growth; what is legitimately ours, but what we do not get, is in excess of the increase. The only practical way to overcome this hindrance is by colonization. The church should appoint agents for this purpose and put work on foot which is trustworthy. In this way people could, to some

extent, be kept together. But this is a difficulty with which the church has ever contended since her establishment in America, and which will likely continue an obstacle as long as immigration continues. Pastors in settled congregations could do much to prevent this helter-skelter locating, by wholesome advice. How many persons rue their isolation, we have had occasion to observe; but when people are once encumbered by real estate it takes a herculean effort to sacrifice a part of it for the sake of the gospel. They remain where they are, and either become worldly-minded, or pillow the conscience by joining some other church.

The present is the time to possess the Pacific Slope. The material development is proceeding with seven-league boots. Eastern and foreign capital is coming in and there seems to be no limit to what men will venture. As yet it is comparatively easy to acquire church property. One man now will be as good as four in ten years. The population is energetic and vigorous, and we should educate and send out a class of ministers who will be able to cope with it. Our own people are sharing in the material development and we may look forward to the time when they will be liberal; in which virtue they are nothing behind now. There are great things in store for the Lutheran Church in the far west, and we pray that she may be aroused to her prospects and her duty. L. H. SCHUH.

PASTORAL STUDY.

Ministers generally concede that some of their time must be devoted to study. But some are faulty in their practice, notwithstanding their convictions and concessions. We desire occasionally to stir up the pure minds of these brethren by way of remembrance. There is much work to be done in the ministry, and work of the most important

and urgent kind. But it is all wrong to make this an excuse for neglecting study. The work is too important to think of doing it without the needful preparation. Trying to speak when a person has nothing to say, is sorry business. If we want to get an attentive hearing we must have something that is worthy of being heard. This cannot be done without diligent study. A minister can neither be faithful nor successful without giving heed to this as a necessary part of his calling.

We have an extract or two to lay before our ministers on this subject. They are from Vinet's "Pastoral Theology." He says: "First, the study of the Bible. This, even when divested of everything scientific, is inexhaustible, and leads to new discoveries even to the end of life. For the pastor it is both obligatory and necessary; obligatory, since his business is nothing other than preaching the Word of God; and thus his ministry will be interesting and fruitful in proportion as his word is penetrated with the substance, and even with the letter of the Divine Word. I need not enlarge on the richness and the interest of the preaching of a minister who does not confine himself to knowing certain parts of the Bible, but who understands and cites every part. Such study is equally necessary for the care of souls. We run the risk of being often unprovided for occasions as they arise, if we are not familiar with the Bible. What power has not a profound knowledge of the Gospel given to certain missionaries? They doubtless have not learned it by heart, but they have heart-knowledge of it. This is the best knowledge, which belongs only to those who have felt its power. Let the minister read the Bible as a pastor and a Christian: there is danger of reading it chiefly as a preacher. He should seek in it not merely passages and texts, but power, virtue, inspiration. Otherwise he will consult it not as a book, but as a collection of verses."

But not all our time for study is to be devoted directly to the Bible. We must have other books, and have them not merely as ornaments for the library, but for diligent use. "Practice apart, thought is impoverished if we do not study. This has been felt by the most lively and productive minds. We cannot of ourselves nourish ourselves; we must receive in order to produce. Study, it is true, is not confined to reading. When we have learned something from books, and from the Book par excellence as well as from others, we must exercise our powers to assimilate it to ourselves as we do our bodily food. But when, without intercourse with books, or in the absence of facts we labor alone, what supports our labors besides our own recollections? Whence come our thoughts, if not from facts, or from books, or from social intercourse, another great book which demands our study? We must study, then, to excite and enrich our own mind by means of other men's. Those who do not study find their talents enfeebled, and their minds become decrepit before the time. In respect to preaching experience demonstrates this most abundantly. Whence comes it that teachers, much admired at their beginning, decline so rapidly, or remain so much below the hopes to which they had given birth? Most frequently it is because they did not continue their studies. A faithful pastor always studies to a certain extent. Besides the Bible he constantly reads the book of human nature, which is always open before him. But this unscientific study does not suffice. Without incessant application we may make sermons, even good sermons, but they will all more and more resemble each other. A preacher, on the contrary, who pursues a course of solid thinking, who nourishes his mind by various reading, will always be interesting. He who is governed by singleness of purpose will find in all books, even in those which do not relate directly to the ministry, something which he can use in preaching."

To do this we must realize the value of time and economize it. Let none be wasted in idleness or in minding

other people's business. "We save time by doing nothing superfluous, and by not adding superfluous things to our necessary works, and by combining some works with others. We save it by knowing how to defend it against importunity and indiscretion. It is difficult to do this when looked at in a worldly aspect, but easier when regarded as a religious duty. We cannot here too earnestly recommend to the minister the habit of early rising. The hour of dawn is the golden hour. Later there is in the mind a sort of noise of all external and internal ideas. At dawn nothing has preceded our impressions, and nothing embarrasses them. Without considering that the minister can answer less than another for what his day is to be, he ought to appreciate more than any other the advantages of this custom." If the minister will take good care of his time, squandering none upon inanities and vanities, and conceding nothing to the indolence and pleasure-seeking of the flesh, he can find hours enough for study. And how can he give account if he neglects his opportunities?

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. X. DECEMBER, 1890. NO. 6.

THE USE OF FICTION.

"Give attendance to reading," is one of the admonitions given by St. Paul to his beloved Timothy. Since then reading matter has multiplied in proportions that may be styled immense. But all the greater is the need now for heeding the admonition, especially on the part of pastors. Those who neglect it will not be able to make full proof of their ministry. The press is a power which it is impossible for those to ignore who would exert an influence among their fellow-men. When the laity read so much, the pastor must not presume that he can maintain his position and accomplish his work without giving attendance to reading.

That which the ambassadors for God must read mainly is the Word which they are sent to proclaim and bring home to the hearts of the people. All other reading would be unprofitable without this, and to this all is secondary. But the pastor must not be ignorant of the things which God has made, and which He has done, and still is doing in the world. He should give attendance to reading books of various kinds, that he may profit by the results of others' labors in the fields of learning and literature. It is a shame for a preacher of the Gospel to be ignorant when God has given him an opportunity to learn. It is true that God does not need our learning in art and science and history to accomplish

the purpose of His grace, but he certainly does not need our ignorance. The well-read man will attain larger results in the pastoral work than the illiterate, though both use the same means of grace and God alone gives the increase. A minister must read, or he will soon lose his hold upon the people.

In his reading shall he also include fiction? The fact that so much of human observation and thought and sentiment is put at present in this form makes it a question of importance to ministers. If such reading is sinful or always dangerous, he must abstain from it and seek to guard the people of his charge against it. We think that both those who condemn it as sinful and those who declare it to be free from all danger are in error, and that the evil, as in the case of drinking wine, lies in the excess. Temperance in all such matters is a virtue, but it does not follow that indulgence within the bounds of moderation is a vice, though it does follow that where indulgence renders appetite uncontrollable and thus leads to inevitable excess, abstinence is a duty.

There are those who insist that all fiction is sinful because it is falsehood, and that all reading of fiction is sinful because it encourages lying and subjects the soul to the influence of lies. They do not admit that the use of fiction could be right under any circumstances, because they maintain that the thing is wrong, and of course they are right in their contention that wrong-doing is always to be condemned, whether indulgence in it be moderate or excessive. The law of temperance has nothing to do with matters that are in themselves sinful. The law condemns stealing a little thing as well as a large thing, condemns stealing once a year as well as once a day. It is the theft that is damnable, whether practiced much or little. To teach moderation in sin is nonsense. The sin must be renounced and abhorred, not practiced moderately or temperately. Novels and romances are not to be placed in that category. Neither writing them nor reading them is necessarily sinful, and consciences are

needlessly troubled when this is represented as a violation of God's holy law. There is no commandment that forbids works of the imagination,

But is not all fiction to be placed under the head of lying, which is certainly prohibited? That is the view which some entertain of it. The persons represented in many cases never had a real existence and the events narrated never actually took place; or if, in some cases, the characters and occurrences described are historical, they are placed in such combinations and relations as to distort them and render them unreal. On that account the fictitious narration is pronounced falsehood and regarded as a violation of the precept, "Putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor." Eph. 4, 25. But that is by no means unquestionable. Fiction is not fact. So much is certain. But neither does it pretend to be. It does not claim to set forth actual occurrences. No deception is practiced in that regard. It is not lying. It is professedly fiction, and no one has any reason to complain of being misled by it so far as the question of reality is concerned.

The interests of truth are not subserved by denying the claims of the imagination. Its work is just as legitimate as that of the reason. It too is a faculty of God's creation, and it too has its uses. That it may be abused, and that its exercise may lead to error, must be admitted. But that is true of all our faculties, not excepting the cognitive powers. Reason may err and lead to error as well as the imagination. The domain of imagination is different from that of reason, and confounding one with the other will necessarily lead to mistakes which may be of gravest import. But they must not be confounded, and to deny the legitimacy of either because of error into which men have fallen in this regard is folly. Each has its own field and must be judged by its own laws. A dream is not a representation of events taking place in the external world. Its actors and actions are not presented to the senses, and if it were narrated as having actu-

ally occurred in space, before the eyes of men, those who believe would be deceived. Such a narrative would be false, and if one presented it as history he would be lying. But is it a lie to tell a dream as it occurred in the mind? It is the work of the imagination, and as such it is to be presented and judged. Thus set forth the narrative is true. Events occur in the mind as well as in the material world, and when a dream is narrated there need be no more lying about it than when external realities are narrated. There may be lying in either case, but the dream as such is a fact as well as the events in space, and the truth can be spoken and should be spoken in regard to it, as well as in regard to other cognitions.

This may seem to be evading the point in dispute. Dreams will come, it may be said, and we cannot help it. They are facts of nature which come without leave or license from us, and we have not to decide upon their legitimacy. Therefore our argument seems irrelevant. What have dreams to do, it is asked, with the question whether it is right to publish or peruse fictitious narratives? But let it not be overlooked that at present the question is whether fiction belongs to the category of falsehood, and whether narrating imaginary events is lying. When one tells a dream of the night and tells it as it occurred, he tells the truth, not a tissue of lies; it becomes a lie only if he represents these events of the imagination as having occurred in the material world and as having been cognized by his senses as external realities. The lie would consist in deceiving others as to the domain in which the events occurred. When there is no such deception the narrative is not a lie. It presents things as they appeared to the imagination in a dream, and presents them truly. So when we have waking dreams, and narrate them as products of the imagination, there is no deception. They are set forth as what they actually are, not as occurrences presented to the reason, but to the imagination, and therefore as having only subjective reality. They are pre-

sented as fiction, not history. On what ground should such presentation be pronounced lying rather than the narrative of a dream that was presented in sleep? The day-dream is no more a lie than the dream of the night, and the narration of the one is no more a lie than the narration of the other. In either case there could be falsehood only by misrepresenting the matter, as would be done if subjective fancies were set forth as subjective facts.

Nor can we concede that the imagination has no office to perform in the work which man has to do on earth, and that our duty in regard to it is to silence and suppress it. The devil did not create it, nor did he succeed in rendering a faculty which God made utterly useless or incapable of salutary employment. Our faculties are all perverted by the introduction of sin into the world, and the imagination has suffered with the rest of them, no more and no less. Sin pollutes and misdirects it. But it is a creature of God that was designed for noble ends, and it is capable of deliverance from the bondage of corruption, like all the other powers of the soul. It is not excluded from the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, and it is not beyond the reach of the Holy Spirit's sanctifying power. All the imaginations of the thoughts of man's heart are only evil continually since the fall, until the grace of God for Christ's sake restore the divine image in which man was created; but we might as well on that account condemn all thinking as all imagining. Let only the soul be sanctified, and imagination will be as useful and salutary in its own domain as sense or reason in the sphere which God has assigned to these powers.

If any one has remaining doubts about this, let him but open his Bible to see what employment is given to the imagination in setting forth the gracious revelation of God for man's salvation. We will not dwell upon the parable of our Lord in illustration, as it might be argued by those who deny the validity and legitimacy of fiction that they are all narratives, in every particular, of real transactions by actual

persons, in the order of time and relations of space, exactly as related for the explanation of similar occurrences in the spiritual kingdom established by our Savior. But we must call the attention of the matter-of-fact people, who can see only falsehood in poetry and every form of fiction, to the frequent use of figures of speech in the Holy Scriptures—figures suggested by the imagination that are often as bold as they are beautiful and sublime. Or do these people imagine—for they too use their imaginations in spite of their theories—that holy men moved by the Holy Ghost meant to set forth truth as presented to the senses when they spoke of lifeless objects as if they could walk and irrational creatures as if they could talk? The psalmist, for instance, says: "When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Jacob from a people of strange language, Judah was his sanctuary, and Israel his dominion. The sea saw it and fled, Jordan was driven back. The mountains skipped like rams and the little hills like lambs." Ps. 114, 1–4. Is that not true? But does it not state what appeared to the imagination rather than to the sense? He who would reject from literature and art all that is not strictly fact in the world of sense would deprive mankind of much that is brightest and most beautiful on earth, and that God in mercy designed for our comfort and cheer on our journey through this wilderness. He would act on the same principle as he who denounces the flowers because whatever else they may be good for, they are not good to eat.

It is argued, again, that if the presentation of fiction does not come under the head of lying and deceiving, it must be shunned by Christians as belonging to the forbidden pleasures of this life. That works of the imagination afford pleasure is at once conceded. But where is such pleasure forbidden? Gloomy imaginations, furnishing an instance of the abuse of a power to construct an argument against its use, have pictured a morose and sullen Christianity that shuns all joy and seeks the cross in the imposi-

tion of needless burdens, and in this fancied religion all pleasure may be forbidden. But where does the Bible say that it is a sin to rejoice? In healthy Christians the question itself provokes a smile. There are pleasures that are sinful; about that there can be no dispute. The gratification of the lusts of the flesh is pleasurable, and those who live in such pleasures, instead of crucifying the flesh with its affections and lusts, shall die. But it would be neither reasonable nor righteous to conclude from this that pleasure as such is sin. Christianity is not responsible for such illogical reasoning and such pitiful confusion. The gratification of holy desires affords pleasure also. Let no one think that there can be no joy in the service of the Lord. "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord," said the psalmist, and what sincere child of God cannot appropriate the words? "The ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads," says the prophet; "they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." Isa. 35, 10. The apostle says: "Rejoice in the Lord alway, and again I say, Rejoice." Phil. 4, 4. And in heaven there shall be joy and gladness in the assembly of the saints and angels throughout eternity; as the psalmist says, "for Thy presence is fullness of joy; at Thy right hand there are pleasures forevermore." Ps. 16, 11. How would pleasure then merely as such be sinful?

The reply may be made that the joy and gladness of which the Scriptures speak is that which comes by faith in Christ Jesus, and results from the appreciation of God's love and mercy and the unspeakable treasures which these provide. And this is true. The Bible never commends, but always condemns, carnal pleasures, because they spring from satanic influence and lead to destruction. But it speaks of pleasures resulting from other sources, and shows that there are pleasures which are commendable as well as pleasures

which are condemnable. And that is just what we desire to show. If there are pleasures which are right and good, then pleasure in itself cannot be a damnable thing, which Christians must shun simply because it is pleasure.

We need not be told that this does not prove the indulgence in fiction as a means of affording pleasure to be right. That is not here and now our contention. Our argument is not that works of the imagination must be good because they furnish enjoyment. That would be a fallacy. There are many things which afford pleasure, but which are sinful. They are unlawful, and the pleasure which they give is unlawful. We are merely answering the false argument that fiction must be sinful because it affords pleasure, which would be correct reasoning only on the assumption that all pleasure is sin. There are pleasures which have their source in faith and love, and which are right and good. Fiction cannot be classed with the forbidden works of the flesh merely because, like them, it affords pleasure. It is not pleasure that is forbidden, but the sin from which carnal pleasure springs. Whether the pleasure which works of the imagination bring is sinful, depends on the further question whether these works are sinful. The pleasure arising from them proves nothing one way or the other.

It is possible to abuse the power of imagining things as they might be, as it is possible to abuse the power of imagining things as they are or as they have been; and it is possible to abuse the products of such imagining power as well as the products of other faculties of the mind. But the mere use is not wrong, and pleasure derived from such use is not sinful. Poetry has as legitimate a place in the world as science, and fiction has its proper use as well as fact, each in its own place and order and proportion. Any wrong in regard to the works of the imagination must lie in the wrong employment of a noble and useful power, just as any wrong in the works of reason must lie in the wrong use of this precious gift, not in the employment itself of these faculties.

Should then the reading of fiction be recommended? That, it will be observed, is again a different question. It must not be forbidden as a thing that is always and under all circumstances a sin. Christian liberty must assert its rights. A man does not necessarily sin when he reads a novel. But that is not recommending such reading. When we have the right to read it we have the right also to let it alone. "All things are lawful unto me," says St. Paul, "but all things are not expedient." 1 Cor. 6, 12. Reading fiction is free, but the careful Christian will see that he does not abuse his liberty.

In general we do not recommend the reading of novels. We rather advise against it. What is necessary for the accomplishment of the ends of life is attainable without it. There are dangers connected with it on account of which prudence dictates its avoidance.

One of these dangers is that it will become a passion whose mastery over the mind can work only injury. In thousands of instances this has been the result. There is a fascination in fiction which few readers can wholly withstand, and to which the greater number succumbs. It requires but little mental labor to follow the development of a story, and the curiosity aroused and surprises offered keep up the interest in the narrative, even if there should be little in the characters and scenes and thoughts and sentiments to excite admiration and hold the attention. How great is the attraction presented by novels and romances is manifest from the immense number published and circulated. They find thousands of readers where solid books scarcely find scores. And of these thousands of readers a large proportion read nothing else, with perhaps the exception of newspapers, and even in these the matter that most nearly resembles fiction is selected for perusal. The mind gradually becomes enslaved by a passion for novels, as it does by the passion for gaming or drinking. A game or a drink or a novel may be innocently enjoyed, but there is a danger

lurking in all such indulgences. Novel reading easily becomes a passion, and then it is ruinous. Therefore caution is necessary.

Another danger connected with novel reading is that all literature of a less piquant kind becomes distasteful. It begets a craving for excitement which the sober facts of history and science fail to satisfy. Stimulants become a necessity from habit, and the appetite grows by what it feeds upon. The ordinary course of events in human life seem dull and dreary, and all representation of things as they are, appear stale and flat. Accustomed to move in a domain of extravagance and amid a whirl of excitement, the mind is repelled from the contemplation of nature and life in its every day garb. The imagination is exercised at the expense of the reasoning faculties, and its development is unhealthy in proportion as it is unreasonable. The power of concentration is lost in the daily revels of fancy and feeling. A mind so one-sidedly employed and so unevenly developed, so trained to mere passivity and gratification of appetite, is unfitted for the effective use of the intellectual faculties. Thinking is too tedious and too arduous a work to be engaged in. Indeed, the mind has by self-indulgence largely lost the power of connected thought. All reasoning seems dry and uninteresting, and the craving for stimulants disables the will. Sound learning has no charms for such a mind, and the debility consequent upon abuse leaves no self-determining power to compel attention to that which presents no attraction. Even the exercise of memory and the more sober use of the image-forming power in the representation of historical fact and the picturing of natural objects and scenery, becomes repulsive. The passion for fiction destroys all taste for the real and all impulse to exercise the faculties which alone perform the mind's hard work.

A third danger lies in the action of such reading on the sensibilities. Fiction often melts the heart by its pathos,

and thus, so far at least as it does not violate purity, seems to cultivate the affections. This apparently furnishes an argument in its favor. But in reality does the reverse. As a rule it hardens in proportion as it melts. The romantic sentimentalist, who is always ready with his tears when appeals are made to his sympathies, is usually unready with his help. The feeling exhausts itself in self-indulgence and inaction. It burns out and burns away all the forces of the soul that were designed to act as motive powers productive of corresponding action. It is a matter of experience that frequently the most hard-hearted people in a crowd are those whose souls sentimentalism has rendered soft and flabby, who pour their grief in streams from their eyes and wring their hands and lift up their voices in the agony of sympathy, but move not a sympathetic finger and offer no sympathetic dime to relieve distress or alleviate pain. Those who build great expectations upon the gush and galore of novel-readers and theater-goers, whose deeds are to be done coincident with the sentiment which these profess, will generally be doomed to disappointment. Such sentimentalists are not necessarily conscious hypocrites. They do feel. But the feeling is maudlin and merciless, like that of some soft-hearted inebriates whose whole heart resolves itself into a mush that can move nothing. Nor is this a great psychological mystery. These are emotions of pleasure and of pain which have no object beyond themselves. They are not directly motives, and they have accomplished their end in the gladness or sadness which the heart experiences. We view a landscape or read a poem and rejoice in its beauty. They please, and the pleasure itself is legitimate, whether any further results flow from the experience or not. We view the somber aspect of nature in the autumn or walk in silence among the groves, and a pensive sadness subdues the soul. Perhaps this may lead to thoughts and feelings that will bear fruit in our active life; but the emotions awakened are proper, independently of any ultimate action to which

they may lead. Emotions are not in themselves motives, and no harm is done if they spend their force in the mere pleasure or pain. They are subserving the purpose of the Creator, so far as they are immediately concerned, even without leading to anything beyond. But that is not the case with the desires and affections that are motive powers. They have an object outside of the soul upon which they are designed to act, as the mere emotions have not. We have pleasure, and as such we enjoy it. There is nothing to be done in regard to it but to enjoy it. Desires may be awakened in regard to the objects from which it arises or with which it is associated, but the emotion as such has no object external to the person experiencing it. When we have a desire or an affection it is otherwise. The desire has an object which it seeks to obtain, the love or hate has an object which it seeks to benefit or injure. The excitement of sensibilities which, according to the created nature of the soul, must needs act in order to attain their purpose, without furnishing them an appropriate object upon which to act and a fitting opportunity to perform the corresponding action, is damaging and deadly. Desires and affections want something to do; they are motives to do something; they push outward and press toward gratification. The refusal to give them an opportunity for the action which their nature demands, deadens them. It is therefore ruinous to treat them as mere emotions. To cherish the love of our neighbor and cultivate sympathy with him in his joys and sorrows merely for the sake of the pleasure which this brings, while the sensibility is completely severed from the will, and corresponding action is no longer even suggested, is effectually to harden the heart, though it seems extremely sensitive. No observer of men has failed to notice how some will moan and wail at the sight of want and woe which they have the means to relieve at once, but which they contemplate with a self-complacent indulgence of sympathy—as if the whole scene of wretchedness were a stage representation—and then

leave the sufferer in his distress. A man who is not a sickly sentimentalist, but of healthy heart and kindly affections, would feel more deeply for others' woe and suffer no tears or hand-wringings to interfere with furnishing the help which is needed and to which his heart prompts. The sentiment which is awakened by fiction has no proper object presented upon which it could act; the circumstances in which it is excited afford no opportunity for its appropriate exercise; all the sensibilities become mere emotions of pleasure or of pain, and cease to be impulses and motives to action. Thus all the helpfulness to which the social desires and affections were designed to lead is banished, and the soul is burnt out by the fires that were meant by the Creator to warm it and set its powers in motion for others' good. The natural tendency of fiction is to produce morbid sentimentalists, and they that are wise will beware of its seduction.

There is one more danger to which we would refer. It is closely related to that which has just been set forth. Intemperate readers of fiction always beget views of life that are more or less distorted, and become in that degree unfitted for the practical duties which human vocations require. Some become crazed, all are rendered in some measure impracticable. How pernicious has been the effect of dime novels, especially of the "blood and thunder" sort, on young boys and girls, who have by their perusal been led to the wildest adventures and most woful extravagances, the newspapers of the day have informed the public and still keep informing their readers. Statistics have shown that a large percentage of the divorces that are so frequent in our time are traceable to the romantic notions which are imbibed by excessive indulgence in novel reading. Expectations are excited respecting the conduct of lords and ladies which are always disappointed in the real world, and misery and separations ensue. But aside from such palpable effects, which attract general notice because they are so dis-

astrous, there are others of daily occurrence which, though they excite no horror, contribute not a little to the sum of human folly and human misery. Minds gradually become unfitted to deal with the stern realities of the work-day world and incapable of adapting themselves to the varied and ever changing circumstances by which their earthly life is surrounded. The real does not always correspond to the ideal; the men and women among whom the work of our vocation is performed and with whom we have daily intercourse for business and pleasure are not always such as those with whom fiction has made us acquainted. Nor are human purposes and plans, the environments in which they are executed, and the results achieved, always as fancy paints them. Those who accustom themselves to the life which fiction presents are therefore doomed to frequent disappointment and defeat in the real world. They are impracticables, and their life is in consequence a failure. They project the persons and relations of their fancy into the world of sense, and so far forth they are demented, and incapable of successful dealing with men and theirs as they really are. How much of the silliness and suffering of man is to be referred to this abuse of fiction cannot be fully known, but it unquestionably supplies a large contingent. The danger in that direction wise men will not treat with indifference.

These dangers connected with fiction, which may be called the wine of literature, admonish to great caution in its use. If it is used at all it must be used with moderation as to the quantity and with judicious care as to the quality.

There are some cases in which prudence dictates that, at least in the form of novels and romances, it should not be used at all. Those who, whether from lack of inclination or lack of time, read but little, should not permit that little to consist of fictitious stories. There is too much also that is of more importance; and some reading other than fiction is needful, as fiction is not. Christians would undoubtedly be

sinning against their own souls if they substituted romances for the Bible at the head of the list of books to be read, and then neglected the reading of the former on the plea that they had no time for it, while they have time for the latter. And more than this must be maintained. The neglect of devotional reading in order to have time for perusing novels is a symptom of decaying piety, and calls for warning. When religious periodicals and books are not purchased or, if they are brought into the home are cast aside as dry and uninteresting, while the novel is taken up and read with avidity, there is proof furnished of a spiritual condition that ought to alarm the persons concerned. Fiction, which is legitimately only a condiment or a relish, has then taken the place of the needful mental food, and a morbid state is manifested in the morbid appetite, the gratification of which will only enhance the disease and hasten the death to which it tends. Even in regard to the present life such an absorbing use of fiction is dangerous, and should be shunned and warned against. Legitimate as the work and product of the imagination are in their proper place, they never can form the staple of life. There is a real world, and there is work in it for us all. The imaginary may afford us some rest and some enjoyment in the toil and turmoil of earth, but they do not furnish us the field and the forces of our activity in life. The real world about us, its history and the science of its contents, is of more account to us than the dreams of fancy, and those who devote themselves wholly to the latter, so far as such devotion takes form in reading, to the disparagement and neglect of the former, are pursuing a course that must sooner or later visit vengeance upon their folly. This is true even when we do not look beyond this present life. But it needs special emphasis when the life beyond the grave is kept in view. The man and woman who read novels while there is much to learn for a successful prosecution of the vocation in which they are engaged, and books to be read which would furnish them the much-needed

knowledge, are walking in the ways of fools. Much more is this the case when the interest in fiction is displacing all interest in the soul's salvation, and in such literature as would promote it. When the reading of novels thus obtains the ascendancy over all other reading, the passion is created that requires abstinence. It is wise to break all bonds that enslave us. The reading of fiction is permissible, but it is not necessary; it is an indifferent thing which is subject to our choice: and when it threatens our destruction the wisest thing to be done is to renounce it utterly.

But this does not apply to all readers. There are many who read a great deal, and who can occasionally read fiction without interfering with their pursuit of more needful knowledge. The imagination requires culture as well as the other faculties of the mind, and may be used with profit as well as all the rest. But this must be in due proportion. When much time can be devoted to literature, fiction may afford desirable relaxation and prove refreshing and invigorating. If used in that sense and spirit it is not an abuse of Christian liberty to devote an occasional half-hour to works of the imagination, as the busiest men devote an occasional half-hour to play. Besides, in this age of novels there is much thrown into the form of fiction which men who seek to keep posted in current literature cannot well avoid reading, though it afford but little opportunity to unbend the mind and secure rest. Not that every theory and scheme that is offered to the public in the garb of fiction must receive attention. Least of all can it be required that the novels presenting it be read. That can not be done in regard to books that set forth important fact and truth in direct didactic form. But among the thousands of novels published there is occasionally one of such importance in matter and form, and of such influence in the community, that Christians of literary culture, and especially such as belong to the learned professions, can scarcely afford to ignore them. We do not say that in such instances it becomes a

duty to read what is acting as a ferment among the people; every man must judge for himself in things indifferent as to what is best for him and for the accomplishment of his work; but certainly the reading of such exceptional productions may suggest itself as wise, and no thoughtful Christian will condemn another for acting in accordance with the suggestion. The dangers which we have pointed out will not be incurred, if due moderation be observed in the reading of such books.

One more counsel must be given in conclusion. If fiction is read at all, it should be only the best. As a rule the noblest work of the imagination is found in the standard poets, and for the culture of this faculty they deserve the first place. But not all have taste for these. Novels and romances are mostly preferred. But among these there are some that should be absolutely shunned as we shun vipers. They are filth with which only fools will befoul their minds, and from which parents must protect their children. The reading of these must be forbidden, as the trifling with firearms and poisons must be forbidden. No caution or moderation in their use will be a safeguard against their pollution. We must have nothing to do with them: touch not the unclean thing. And just because there are such dirty and destructive publications scattered all over the country and passed around among the young, parents should permit no story paper and no novel to be brought into their homes or used by their children without first examining them and assuring themselves that they do not belong to the satanic class. Indeed, readers generally, and especially young people, would do well never to read a novel without a recommendation from some person whose judgment is trustworthy. That would secure protection also against the innumerable works of fiction which, though they are not directed against religion and good morals, are objectionable on other grounds. Life is too short and its duties too important to allow of

wasting precious hours in reading nonsense, and that often dressed in ragged English. Even some of the stories prepared for Sunday-schools and read by thousands of Christian families picture men, women, and children as they do not exist and never did exist. Such novels, not those which represent nature as it is or as, with its inherent powers, under some circumstances it might be, really are subject to the charge of lying. They distort and pervert and misrepresent and mislead. If novels are to be read we should at least select such as are true to nature, and representing impossibilities and contradictions as ideal realities, and such as present rational matter in a style that pleases and profits. Those who care nothing about the quality of fiction would better let it alone. Their use of it will of necessity prove harmful.

It cannot be denied that excessive novel-reading is one of the evils of our time. It is a prolific source of mischief and misery, and like a cancer it is eating around it in the community. We do not wonder therefore that cautious and conscientious parents, teachers and pastors lift their voices in warning against it. But let efforts to overcome the evil be made upon the right principle. If it is alleged that reading fiction, no matter in what measure or of what kind, is a sin, intelligent Christians will ask for the proof from the Word of God, as they have a right to ask; and in the absence of such proof they will not plead guilty of sin merely because a parent or pastor has pronounced it such. It cannot be prohibited as a transgression of divine law, no more than can the drinking of wine; but, like the drinking of wine, it often proves dangerous, and therefore needs constant watching and warning. M. Loy.

PARALLELS BETWEEN ST. PAUL AND LUTHER.

The great apostle of the Gentiles, and the reformer of the Church in the sixteenth century have sometimes been compared with each other. The points of comparison are certainly not few, nor merely incidental or casual. The similarity of the lives, the labors, the conflicts, the teachings, and above all, the characters of these two men of God, is so real, so actual and positive, that we cannot fail to see it. There are so many clear, distinct and complete parallels between these men that we are led to the inevitable conclusion, that both were moved by the same motives and principles. It shall be our design in this article to point out a few of these remarkable parallels between St. Paul and Martin Luther, without forgetting the vast difference between the inspired apostle and the reformer.

Saul of Tarsus was a Pharisee indeed. The great apostle could well say in his noble defense before Agrippa, "after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee." (Acts 26, 5.) He not only professed to be a Pharisee, but what was more, he *lived* one. In heart and mind, in thought and purpose, in word and deed, he was a Pharisee. There was not the least tinge of insincerity, dissimulation or deceitfulness in the character of Saul of Tarsus; he was in every respect what he appeared to be. A Hebrew of the Hebrews, and as touching the law, blameless, he was a model Pharisee, not a "painted" one. He bore no resemblance to those shallow-minded, vain and empty Pharisees, who were puffed up with a bloated self-esteem. In the language of Canon Farrar (Life and Work of St. Paul), Saul of Tarsus resembled "the only class of Pharisee to which he, as a true and high-minded Israelite would have borne any shadow of resemblance, and that not in a spirit of self-contentment, but in a spirit of almost morbid and feverish anxiety to do all

that was commanded, would be the Tell-me-anything-more-to-do-and-I-will-do-it Pharisee!" The obedience of this man to the demands of the law was extremely rigid and precise. He must have believed that a scrupulous obedience was due to every one of the 248 commands and 365 prohibitions of that law. His ideal of obedience must have been a blameless, stainless, perfect life in thought, word and deed. It is not likely that he made much of the nice, rabbinical distinctions of "light" and "heavy" in these commands and prohibitions. No doubt he believed and taught that a perfect compliance, not only with the letter and spirit of the law was necessary unto righteousness; but also that the numberless interpretations and applications of that law and the "traditions of the elders," were just as authoritative as the commands and prohibitions given to Moses by Jehovah Himself.

Saul of Tarsus was a model Pharisee; Brother Martin a model monk. Never was monk more sincere and devout than Luther. When by intense application to study in his cloister cell, he neglected to repeat the prescribed prayers, he would try to silence the reproving voice of his conscience by shutting himself up in order by saying long prayers to make good his delinquencies. He would abstain from food and drink for whole days and nights in succession. In consequence of fasting, vigils, and long devotions he once deprived himself of sleep for nearly five consecutive weeks, so that he almost became deranged. On another occasion, being in great mental and spiritual distress, he locked himself up in his cell and did not permit any one to approach him for several days. Finally some of his friends forcibly opened the door of his cell, and on entering found him lying senseless on the floor. By means of cheerful music he was restored to consciousness. Martin Luther could well say: "I speak what is true, when I say that I was a pious monk, and so strictly observed the rules of my order, that I can

declare, if ever a monk by monastic exercises obtained salvation, I would have obtained it too. In this, all my monastic associates who knew me, will bear me witness; for, if it had continued longer, I would have tormented myself to death by keeping vigils, saying prayers, by reading, and other works." (Meurer's Life of Luther).

But the soul cannot find rest and peace by the works of man's righteousness. This was the experience of St. Paul and of Luther. Notwithstanding his high attainments in Pharisaic holiness, Saul of Tarsus deeply felt his imperfections. He was as a Pharisee laboring under the monstrous error, that the righteousness which avails in the sight of God could be obtained by external practices and ceremonial observances. Notwithstanding his blamelessness as touching the law, he felt the incompetency, the insufficiency and the hollowness of a mere external obedience. We can trace in the Epistles of St. Paul how deeply the Pharisee, Saul of Tarsus, felt and deplored his inability to reach the high ideal of perfection. He surely was impressed to the highest degree with the full meaning of the expression, "the curse of the law.' He certainly experienced to its fullest extent that the law is spiritual, whilst he was carnal. He agonized and groaned under the heavy burden of self-imposed works. Even his Pharisaic perfection could not satisfy him. All his efforts and achievements could not still the longings of his soul or hush the voice of his conscience.

Martin Luther, the Augustinian monk at Erfurt, had similar experiences with Saul of Tarsus. All the fastings and vigils, the reading and praying, the self-torturing and tormenting failed to give Brother Martin the longed-for rest unto his soul. With all his monkish works and exercises, mortifying the flesh and practicing the severest self-denial, he accomplished nothing. Even the sacrament of the mass did not give him any comfort. The soul-conflicts of this devout monk were terrible. His bodily health was seriously

impaired and his mind became a prey to melancholy and despair.

Both St. Paul and Luther longed for true righteousness. But they sought it where it could not be found. "The experience of Saul of Tarsus was a heart-rending experience of all who have looked for peace elsewhere than in the love of God. All that Luther suffered at Erfurt Saul must have suffered in Jerusalem; and the record of the early religious agonies and awakenment of the one is the best commentary on the experience of the other." (Farrar's Life and Work of St. Paul).

The parallel traits of character between St. Paul the former Pharisee, and Luther the former monk, with reference to sincerity of heart and honesty of will and purpose, are obvious to our minds. But in addition to these features we observe in both a striking similarity in zealousness, devotedness to what they considered duty, activity, and moral courage. There surely was not a more zealous and devoted and active and courageous member of the Pharisaic sect than Saul of Tarsus. In him we see manifested a zeal for God and for the law that prompted him to hate the Nazarenes with an intense hatred, consenting to the death of Stephen, the proto-martyr of Christians, breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples, persecuting them even unto strange cities, bringing men and women bound unto Jerusalem and doing many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Acts. 9, 1. 2; 26, 9. 12. He could truly say, "I advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of mine own age, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers." (Gal. 1, 14, Rev. Version.) But the fiery, impetuous zeal of this model Pharisee was a zeal not according to knowledge (Rom. 10, 2). He was a blasphemer and violent persecutor and injurious, but he obtained mercy, because he did it ignorantly in unbelief (1 Tim. 1, 13). However, when this bold blasphemer and

violent persecutor, Saul of Tarsus, had been changed into Paul, the apostle of Jesus Christ, all his zeal, his ardor, his activity, his courage, and all the powers of his mind and body, were devoted and consecrated to the service of Him who had appeared to him when on his way to Damascus, Jesus whom he had persecuted. After his conversion he was willing to spend and to be spent for his Divine Master, to labor unceasingly and unremittingly in the cause of Christ, and to suffer and endure all things for His sake. No persecutions, no sufferings, no trials of any kind could deter him from testifying for Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah of Israel and the Redeemer of the human race. With undaunted courage and fearless intrepidity he could say: "But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God." Acts 20, 24. He was ready and willing to go to Jerusalem, even into the midst of his bitterest enemies, and preach the Gospel of Christ there. "I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts 21, 13. He carried the joyful tidings of redemption to many countries and cities. He went on three grand missionary journeys, preaching to Jews and Gentiles, Greeks and barbarians, the unsearchable riches of Christ, contending at Antioch against judaizing teachers and false apostles, planting the banner of the cross among the Celtic tribes of Galatia, converting the Macedonians to the truth in Christ Jesus, bringing Jews and Gentiles at Thessalonica into the one fold under the one great Shepherd, declaring the Unknown God in Athens, the fountainhead of Grecian learning and philosophy, disputing with Stoics and Epicureans, preaching Christ, and the resurrection and judgment to come, before the assembled Areopagus on Mars hill, gathering a congregation of believers in the city of Corinth, noted

for its trade, its wealth, its art and its luxury, founding a church at Ephesus, celebrated for the magnificent temple of Diana, and preaching in many other cities and towns of the old world. Finally he must also go to Rome, the mistress of nations. One night, whilst at Jerasalem, during his trial before the Sanhedrim, his Divine Master stood by him and said: "Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome." Acts 23, 11. And here in the city built on the seven hills, the capital of the world, the great Apostle of the Gentiles suffered martyrdom for the sake of Jesus whom he had once persecuted.

We are filled with astonishment at the gigantic labors of the great Apostle, who, to judge from intimations scattered here and there in his Epistles, was far from being strong, vigorous and robust in body. His enemies said: "His bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible." (2 Cor. 10, 10). But he possessed a burning zeal, an unquenchable ardor, an unconquerable will, a sublime purpose, and invincible courage. Through Christ he could remove every obstacle, triumph over every foe, and come out of every conflict "more than a conqueror."

Martin Luther manifested great zeal, faithful devotedness to duty, ceaseless activity, and undaunted courage, first as a monk and afterward as the Reformer of the Church. Never was monk more zealous and devoted than he. In the cloister at Erfurt he would willingly perform the lowest menial duties, going from house to house to beg food and money for the use of the monks, cleaning the cloister cells, and the like. He did not feel himself humiliated by performing these duties, for he earnestly desired strictly to fulfill his monastic vows of poverty and obedience.

But when the glorious light of God's Word shone upon the benighted soul of the humble Augustinian monk and he beheld the Gospel of Christ in all its divine fulness and

majesty, then it was, that his ardent zeal for God was turned in the right direction, and became a zeal "according to knowledge." Then he devoted all his intellectual and moral powers to the work of purifying the Church and restoring the true doctrines of the Christian religion to their proper place. The labors of Luther during the Reformation were unceasing. We wonder how he could perform them all and could find time to attend to them all. He began the work by nailing his celebrated 95 Theses to the main portal of the castle-church at Wittenberg. He met and discussed the condition of religious affairs with the papal legates, Cajetan at Augsburg and Miltitz at Altenburg. Next we find him disputing with Dr. Eck at Leipzic on important theological questions. Then he wrote his immortal treatises, "To the Christian Nobles of the German Nation," "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church," and "The Liberty of the Christian." Shortly after he appeared at the imperial diet of Worms, where he confessed Christ in words that will continue to ring through the ages. Then he is concealed for a time in his "Patmos" on the Wartburg, translating the New Testament and writing various treatises on religious subjects, and finally he appears at Wittenberg to oppose the fanatical iconoclasts and revolutionists and to finish the work of the Reformation.

His was indeed a busy life, preaching, teaching, counseling, advising, warning, reproving or comforting as circumstances demanded, either by tongue or pen to prince and peasant, to rich and poor, to high and low alike. Bunsen says of Luther's labor that it was "the work tried in vain for two hundred years by councils, and by prophets, and martyrs, with and without emperors, kings and princes —undertaken by a poor monk alone, who carried it out under the ban of the pope and the empire."

In addition to these colossal labors of the great Reformer his many spiritual trials, his soul-conflicts, his contests

against the powers of darkness, and his many bodily ailments and infirmities must also be taken into consideration. A few months before his death he wrote to his friend, Jacob Probst at Bremen: "I write to you, my Jacob, as an old, decrepit, dull, weary, cold, and now also one-eyed man, who might have hoped that, being now exhausted, I would have been permitted to enjoy the rest which, it seems to me, I have well deserved; but notwithstanding this, I am so engaged with writing, speaking, labors, and business that it would seem as if I had never performed, written, spoken or done anything." (Meurer's Life of Luther.)

The moral courage of Luther was like that of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who in the face of all the dangers that surrounded him could fearlessly say, "None of these things move me." Whether the humble Augustinian monk stood before Cajetan or Miltitz, or before the emperor and the estates of the German commonwealth, he never faltered, but was always ready to "step into the mouth of Behemoth between his great teeth, confess Christ, and leave the issue with Him."

We have thus observed that in ardent zeal for God and His cause, in faithful devotedness to duty, in active labor to extend the kingdom of Christ, and in fearless courage to meet any danger, there are numerous parallel traits of character between St. Paul and Martin Luther. These instances are not casual but positive, and clearly prove that these men of God were governed by the same great religious principles and prompted to act by the same motives.

In addition to the similar features in the characters, the lives, the labors and the actions of these two heroes in the kingdom of Christ shown above, there are other parallels of which we will treat in another article.

P. A. Peter.

THE NEW THEOLOGY IN GERMANY.

A number of circumstances have conspired to make the teachings of the late Albrecht Ritschl and his school the leading discussion in the theological circles of Germany in recent years. The matter is of special importance to Lutherans too, because it is the claim of this school, whose teachings can very properly be termed "the new theology of Germany," that they represent the genuine and original theology of the Reformers and that what now passes as Lutheran orthodoxy, as developed through the Formula of Concord and the great dogmaticians of the sixteenth century, is in reality a perversion of what Luther and his coadjutors taught, being to all intents and purposes nothing but a Lutheran scholasticism. What the "*Kulturkampf*" and the demand of the Evangelical Church, particularly of Prussia, for greater independence from the control of the state and for more funds from the state to carry on her work,—what all this has been and is yet in the department of practical life and work, that the views and positions taken by the famous Goettingen professors have been and constantly are becoming more and more in the department of theological thought and controversy. For to discussion alone Ritschl's school has confined its efforts. It has persistently refused to enter into the arena of practical church work or politico-ecclesiastical agitation such as is the practice of other German church parties in that country where state and church are united. Ritschl's followers have not generally connected themselves with any existing ecclesiastical body, nor have they formed a new one. Although in spirit nearest allied to the "*Protestanten Verein*" and recruited chiefly from its ranks, the school has never associated itself with the aims of the Verein, which are to secure the supremacy of rationalistic principles in the

whole Protestant Church of Germany from the highest consistory and the theological faculties to the humblest village pulpit. Nor can this school be even internally identified with this association. The leading dogmaticians of the rationalistic Verein, the lately deceased Biedermann, Pfleiderer, of Berlin, Lipsius of Jena, are outspoken opponents and at times the severest critics of Ritschl's views. It must though be confessed that the opposition between them touches rather theological premises (Voraussetzungen) and methods than actual conclusions. Both sides aim to be equally destructive of the traditional positions of evangelical theology in general: the difference between them is that they do not attack the stronghold of truth from the same side.

The prominence and importance of Ritschl's views are attributable to other factors than their bearing on the practical life of the Church, however, sure it is that sooner or later the seeds it has all along been sowing must bear their legitimate fruits also in pulpit and pew. Ritschl's great power has been shown in his influence over the younger generation of theologians in modeling and remodeling their dogmatical views and furnishing them with a theological system that has proved itself able to fill with enthusiasm and confidence some of the brightest minds of Germany, and even to persuade older men, whose theological views have been the result of decades of study, to yield more or less to the new views propounded. The most notable examples in this direction are Professor Werzsœcker, the successor of Bauer, who headed the famous Tuebingen school of New Testament critics, and Professor Schultz, the Gœttingen Old Testament professor. In nearly all the theological faculties of Germany there are representatives of this school, even at Leipzig. Probably Erlangen and Rostock are the only universities free from this spell. In Berlin it is represented by Harnack and Kafton. The latter is the successor

of Dorner and the former, a son of a famous Lutheran professor in Dorpat, is now generally considered the most influential theological teacher in Germany, if not in the world. Even some men who had and have the reputation of being positive theologians have in a measure gone over to Ritschl. No apologist of the latter has been more zealous than Pastor Trikœtter, who strictly maintains that the new theology is in perfect harmony with evangelical teachings. Even so confessionally inclined a man as Professor Engelbrecht, of Dorpat, felt himself strongly attracted to Ritschl.

Over against this array of facts must be placed another, which go to show that Ritschl's theological school, like that philosophical school of Hegel, is divided into a positive and negative wing, the former inclining toward more conservative views, the latter toward a wider and widest latitudinarianism. The most ardent supporters of Ritschl are men of the most neological and negative type of theological thought. His leading pupil and best literary exponent is Professor Hermann, of Marburg. Yet the latter is strongly rationalizing if not rationalistic in his standpoint and methods, and destructive in his results. Another ardent follower is Professor Stade, of Giessen, whose "History of Israel" reduces the religion of the Old Testament to a purely nationalistic scheme in both origin and character. Bender, of Bonn, whose radical address on Luther in 1883 gave such offence to the Church of Germany, claims membership in this charmed circle. Yet his recent work on the Origin of Religion shows that he is a religious agnostic of a type as neological as is Professor Huxley of England.

The enthusiasm developed for the Ritschl school among the younger generation of German theological professors can be readily understood when we remember what the marks of superiority are which are claimed for the new system. It claims to give a more decided emphasis to the universal and divine character of Christianity, basing Christian doctrine

on ethical principles alone. Practically it is thus a system of morals and not a system of theology at all. It claims to be the foe of destructive criticism of the times, and to insist upon the recognition of the authority of the Word in matters of faith; it claims that it can silence the objections of philosophy and natural science to the Christian revelation. But claims that it is a better and more correct exponent and expression of the teachings of Luther and the other reformers. Claims of this sort cannot fail to attract the attention of wide awake young teachers, particularly when it is considered one of the canons of literary ethics, as is the case in Germany that only the producer of "new" results can expect recognition and advancement as a teacher and scholar. It should be remembered in this connection that Ritschl, while employing the terminology of traditional theology, puts into the *terminie technici* as a rule meanings altogether other than those which the usage of centuries has given them. With considerable show of right and reason he and his followers have been charged with dishonesty on this account.

Naturally it is impossible in this connection to give a full and complete account of Ritschl's process and methods. Nor is this necessary in order to form an opinion as to its true inwardness. Even Ritschl himself has not given a rounded view of his system, nor has any of his people. The leading work of Ritschl is his "*Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versoehnung*," in three large volumes, 1882–1883, and in these he treats *in extenso* the central doctrine of the Christian faith from his standpoint; and from these volumes also a comparatively clear idea can be gleaned of what are the fundamental ideas of his hypothesis.

Nearly all the negative dogmaticians of Germany since the days of Hegel have based their systems upon his philosophical views. Only occasionally has the one or the other built upon the opinions of Herbart or some other philosopher.

Ritschl's school departs from the paths of its natural associates by looking for its philosophy, psychology and metaphysics, and indeed even for its religion, to Kant, the founder of modern philosophy. The new system is an application to the theology of the revival of Kantianism that so notably marks the philosophical studies of the hour in Germany. Kant's leading works are his "Critique of Pure Reason," and "Critique of Practical Reason," and "Religion within the Limits of Pure Reason." These three books complete and round off his whole system. The aim of the first mentioned work is to prove the negative propositon that our knowledge through perception (Erkenntniss) is confined to the range of our experience; and that consequently the doctrines of our religion, since these belong to a supersensual domain, cannot thus form the objects of knowledge proper. At the same time Kant maintains that we are thus compelled to look to a subjective source for the fundamental conceptions of religion. To find these is the aim of the second work, where it is maintained that in our natural consciousness we have immediate and imperative conceptions of a duty to observe the moral law, and to accept God, freedom, immortality, not as the objects of knowledge (Erkenntniss) but as moral postulates, e. g. as the necessary preconditions of the moral law. The actual result of this theoretical standpoint are given by Kant in the third mentioned book.

These teachings of the famous Koenigsberg philosopher have furnished Ritschl with a foundation for his theological superstructure. Both his negative and positive theses are a reproduction of the Kantian views. For Ritschl's fundamental theses are these: I. Metaphysics, being the science of things in themselves are to be excluded from dogmatics. We can know an agent only in its actions, and theology has to deal only with "*Werturtheile.*" The untranslatable word plays a great role in Ritschl's system; and it can prob-

ably be best explained by saying that we know only the worth of revealed things to us, but not the character of the agency behind them, nor its manner or way of working. It is from this standpoint that he denies, as beyond and outside of the sphere of dogmatics as indeed unknowable, such fundamental doctrines as the original state of man, original sin, the pre-existence of the divine nature (in essence) of Christ, etc., etc., condemning them as "metaphysical" and as portions of the "neo-Platonic" Christianity which Evangelical theology is accused of having saddled upon the theology of the Bible. From this philosophical and partly agnostic standpoint he interprets the Scriptures radically differently from the accepted manner. For instance, when divine attributes are ascribed to Christ, he does not accept these as statements of attributes actually inherent in His person, but only as expressions of what He is to us — not as *Seine urtheile* but only as *Werturtheile.* He says that the divinity of Christ is only an expression for this idea, that He completely revealed God to the world according to the ethical purposes of God, and that He exercises spiritual world supremacy. In a similar manner he empties the central doctrines of Christianity of their objective, positive and independent existence and reality.

His second thesis, supplying a sort of positive complement to the first, is also Kantian in the extreme. It is this: II) Religion and religious knowledge are based exclusively upon ethical principles. The workings of this principle are seen clearly in his leading book. This treats of the very centre and heart of Christian doctrine, namely the "*Versœhnung,*" which can probably be best translated by "Atonement" and practically covers the same ground, although the literal equivalent is "Reconciliation." It is the testimonial dogmatical term of the Germans for the English Atonement. Ritschl belongs to the large class of German dogmaticians who claim that in the reconciliation effected through Christ

there can have been no change effected on the part of God toward man, but only on the part of man toward God. He claims that the sole principle actuating God in His dealings with man is love; and when the Scriptures attribute justice, righteousness, and other qualities to Him, these must not be understood as in any way interfering with the free and absolute exercise of His love. Accordingly God is love in the sense that excludes all desire to punish. For sin in Ritschl's system, is not transgression, but only an ignorance of the state of affairs existing between God and man; and the atoning work of Christ consists in this, that He made full revelation of this state of affairs and thus secured the removal of this ignorance and sin. Forgiveness of sin is then merely a removal of ignorance. How a system, that is so grossly unscriptural on so fundamental a point as this, can claim to represent the theology of Luther and the Reformation, is simply incomprehensible. The term "sin" and all others that cluster around the atonement, such as righteousness, justification, etc., have in Ritschl's system an altogether different meaning from their traditional usage. And when we remember this, we can also understand that the claims of this school to represent the only possible theology of the future and to being really biblical and churchly in character, is simply preposterous. Luthardt's leading criticism of the system that it is an "*Entwerthung*" of Christian doctrine, i. e. deprives the truths of Revelation of their worth by depriving them of their objective basis and reality, is certainly correct. In reality it is an old error in a new form. It certainly is rationalistic to the core, and practically is nothing more than a moralizing scheme of religion. For over one hundred years the great problems as to whether Christianity and Revelation are of God and are supernatural in origin and character, have been the topics of German theological speculation. Ritschl's new venture

is simply a new form of the naturalistic side of the problem. It is in full harmony with the radical tendencies of the age to develop what Delitzsch correctly called "the religion and theology of the era of Darwin." G. H. SCHODDE.

THE SUPPORT OF OUR SYNOD'S WORK.

WRITTEN AND PUBLISHED BY REQUEST OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

The Lord our God has given us a great work to do. Our field is the United States of America. The Germans and Scandinavians who cross the water by thousands are largely of our faith. God in His providence is leading these people into this land of ours that the Lutheran Church may provide them with the means of grace in a land more favorable to Christian liberty and progress than the countries from which they come. Our Synod concerns herself chiefly about the Lutheran people from Germany. They must be collected into congregations and then supplied with the means of grace.

The tendency of our population has been westward. Thousands of those who are filling up the west and converting the "Great American Desert" into productive farms, and engaging in the various other pursuits of life, are members of our Evangelical Lutheran Church. Unless they are provided with the life-preserving Word of God they will perish in the whirlpool of worldliness and sin. Our large charges already supplied with pastors are more and more realizing the necessity of more pastoral care and more frequent services, and to this end want more pastors. Our institutions of learning are enlarging, and require more men to educate Christian ministers. As synod increases in size it becomes more and more evident that in order to strengthen and pre-

serve the unity of doctrine and practice well qualified men ought to give their whole time and attention to the superintending of the work of synod, and in the interest of her work visit the congregations within her bounds. We need men of ability and self-consecration to edit our church-papers and other publications of synod, and these men should have nothing else to do. We should by all means have more Christian teachers to relieve those pastors who are wearing themselves out in the school-room. From present indications it will not be many years until men will be needed to engage in missionary work properly so-called. The black race is already receiving some attention, and the question is raised whether we should not in the near future establish mission stations among the North American Indians.

Then we have widows and orphans and worn-out preachers, and others needing our attention and support to provide for. There is seemingly no limit to the work that ought to be done; for the millions who as yet know not Christ should be brought to the feet of Jesus, that in Him they might have life.

In view of all this, dear brethren in the ministry, has our synod undertaken too much work? You will certainly agree with me and say: We ought to undertake more. But then *what* shall we do under the circumstances? Our hands are tied. We are not even raising the funds needed to support the work we have undertaken. There is a constant cry of indebtedness and financial danger. It is certainly not because we have undertaken more than we can do; that is, if we understand who all is embraced in that little word *we*. *We* means the whole army of 60 thousand communicant members of our congregations; yea it means more. It means also the forty thousand children who attend our Sunday and Parochial schools. That would make an army one hundred thousand strong; and shall all these people not be

able to support the work undertaken? Why, if every child in synod would collect one dollar, and every communicant member give one dollar, we would have one hundred thousand dollars with which to do our work. But that little word *if* is expressive of doubt. In other words, it is not likely that every child and every adult member in synod will raise on the average even the small amount of one dollar. But I ask the question: Why not?

Pastors will excuse themselves and their congregations on the ground of poverty. They affirm that it is difficult for them to secure the funds needed to support their own congregational work, and that if an effort were made to collect money for the general church work, the work in the congregation would be crippled. This seems plausible, and yet it will not stand. We will admit that there are little congregations, poor in this world's goods, and that, exceptionally, few are not able to do anything outside of their own congregational work. With these few exceptions, the reason why so many are not doing their part is to be sought elsewhere than in the financial condition of the members of our congregations. There are those who are indifferent to any work outside of their own congregation. We here refer not only to lay-members, but there are pastors also who seem to have the same spirit. Possibly they would have no interest in their own congregations, if it were not that they are expecting their support from that source. Their souls being shriveled up, they are afraid to speak of money matters except so far as it pertains to their salary. They are fearful of diminishing their own income by urging the people to contribute for other purposes. No greater mistake could be made. Giving is a matter of education. People must be trained to give for the support of Christ's kingdom. Those who are seldom asked to give, give very meagerly when they are asked. An annual collection in the congregation is just as apt to be made up largely of pennies as a monthly col-

lection. Moreover, if a pastor never speaks about money except when he wants it for his own use, the people come to the conclusion that it is the money he is after. If, on the other hand, he frequently asks them to contribute for the various objects for which money is usually collected, the people get the impression that their pastor is working for Christ's kingdom, and that his own support is not the sole object of his services. The result of this will be that they will not only support our educational and charitable institutions, but will become more liberal and cheerful in the support of their pastor and congregation.

Then there is a congregation about to build a church or school-house or parsonage. The people are right well off, and there is a goodly number of them; but this year they are going to be taxed heavily, and—I guess we will not say anything about our institutions or church-building fund or missions. Another congregation has just erected a church edifice or some other necessary building, and the people are very much in debt on their property. We were not able to do anything last year and it would hardly be proper to ask them this year. At another place the wheat harvest failed, at another the corn crop is not good, at another the people are out of employment and consequently have no income, and so on. In short, it would not be difficult to find an excuse for refusing to support the general church work in almost every congregation. If, however, these home interests are to prevent you from collecting or contributing for these various objects, who is going to support them? If only one-half or three-fourths of the congregations are going to contribute, the work will be lagging. What we must insist on is that every congregation within the bounds of synod support our general Institution Treasury and our Home Mission work. Those refusing to respond must be called to an account. If there are good reasons for not contributing there is no disgrace in having the Church know it, and if there is no good

reason the Church ought to know it. It ought to be thoroughly understood that every pastor and every congregation has a duty to perform in the way of furthering the interests of our various institutions. Synod is an organization consisting of pastors, teachers and congregations. Every pastor, every teacher, every congregation is an integral part of that organization. It is one body and all of us are members. When some of the members of a body refuse to serve the other members, or in a general way refuse to serve the body, we conclude that there is some cause for the lameness or stiffness of the limb and begin to doctor. So when pastors or teachers or congregations refuse to serve synod there is something wrong, and a diagnosis of the case ought to be made at the earliest convenience, and the necessary remedy prescribed.

It is to be feared that some of our pastors fail to present the whole counsel of God. God's plan has always been of such a nature as to require financial support. God, it is true, does not need our money, but He asks it because giving is for our own good. It develops the soul to be exercised in Christian giving. Those who never give become contracted and heartless, and eventually lose all interest in the Church and in their own souls. There is great danger in this direction. Money is power. Money rules the world. The love of money is the root of all evil. Covetousness is idolatry. If our people are not to fall into the sin of bowing down to their gold it is necessary for us to warn them frequently, and to give them frequent opportunities to exercise their faith in the way of contributing towards the support of Christ's kingdom. If need be it would be well occasionally to follow the example of St. James and preach to our worldly-minded, money-loving people as follows: "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered;

and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days. Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of sabaoth. Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton; ye have nourished your hearts, as in a day of slaughter. Ye have condemned and killed the just; and he doth not resist you." Jas. 5, 1–6.

On the other hand, it would be well occasionally to present the value of God's Word and in glowing words show that the truth revealed from heaven is worth more than all gold. "I love Thy commandments above gold; yea above fine gold." Ps. 119, 127. Impress it upon the minds of the people that all their earthly possessions and pleasures are but dirt as compared with the everlasting Gospel. When their bodies are carried to the tomb their temporal wealth is forever gone. They will be no better off in eternity for having been wealthy here below. What a terrible warning Christ gives us in the account of the rich man who fared sumptuously every day and yet refused to use his wealth to relieve the needy. "In hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments," is the account of his condition in eternity, professedly a child of God, but in fact a servant of mammon, an adorer of his gold.

Then our people must learn that we are not masters but simply stewards over the possessions we call our own. We will let another speak our sentiments. Dr. Joseph Strong, in his book entitled *Our Country*, gives a chapter on "Money and the Kingdom." Among other excellent things he says: "What is needed is not simply and increased giving, an enlarged estimate of the 'Lord's share,' but a *radically different conception* of our relations to our possessions. Most Christian men need to discover that they are not pro-

prietors, apportioning their own, but simply trustees or managers of God's property. All Christians would admit that there is a sense in which their all belongs to God, but deem it a very poetical sense, wholly unpractical and practically unreal. The great majority treat their possessions exactly as they would treat property, use their substance exactly as if it were their own.

Christians generally hold that God has a thoroughly real claim on some portion of their income, possibly a tenth, more likely no definite proportion; but some small part, they acknowledge, belongs to Him, and they hold themselves in duty bound to use it for Him. This low and unchristian view has sprung apparently from a misconception of the Old Testament doctrine of tithes. God did not, for the surrender of a part renounce all claim to the remainder. The Jew was taught, in language most explicit and oft repeated, that he and all he had belonged absolutely to God. 'Behold, the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the Lord's, thy God, and the earth also, with all that therein is.' (Deut. 10, 14.) 'The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein.' (Ps. 24, 1.) 'The silver is mine and the gold is mine, saith the Lord.' (Hag. 2, 8.) 'Behold all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine.' (Ezek. 18, 4.) When the priest was consecrated, the blood of the ram was put upon the right ear, the thumb of the right hand, and the great toe of the right foot, to indicate that he should come and go, use his hands and powers of mind, in short, his entire self, in the service of God. These parts of the body were selected as representative of the whole man. The tithe likewise was representative. 'For, if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy.' (Rom. 11, 16.) Tithes were devoted to certain uses, specified by God, in recognition of the fact that all belonged to Him.

God's claim to the whole rests on exactly the same ground as His claim to a part. As the Creator, He must

have an absolute ownership in all His creatures; and, if an absolute claim could be strengthened, it would be by the fact that He who gave us life sustains it, and with His own life redeemed it. 'Ye are not your own; for ye are bought with a price.' (1 Cor. 6, 19. 20.) Manifestly, if God has absolute ownership in us, we can have absolute ownership in nothing whatever. If we cannot lay claim to our own selves, how much less to that which we find in our hands. When we say that no man is the absolute owner of property to the value of one penny, we do not take the socialistic position that private property is theft. Because of our individual trusts, for which we are held personally responsible, we have individual rights touching property, and may have claims one against another; but, between God and the soul, the distinction of *thine* and *mine* is a snare. Does one-tenth belong to God? Then ten-tenths are His. He did not one-tenth create us and we nine-tenths create ourselves. He did not one-tenth redeem us and we nine-tenths redeem ourselves. If His claim to part is good, His claim to the whole is equally good. His ownership in us is no joint affair. We are not in partnership with Him. All that we are and have is utterly His, and His only.

When the Scriptures and reason speak of God's ownership in us they use the word in no accommodated sense. It means all that it can mean in a court of law. It means that God has a right to the service of His own. It means that, since our possessions are His property, they should be used in His service—not a fraction of them, but the whole. When the lord returned from the far country, to reckon with his servants to whom he had entrusted his goods, he demanded not simply a small portion of the increase, but held his servants accountable for both principal and interest—'mine own with usury.' Every dollar that belongs to the Lord must serve Him. And it is not enough that we make a *good* use of our means. We are under exactly the same

obligations to make the *best* use of our money that we are to make a *good* use of it; and to make any use of it other than the best is a maladministration of trust. Here, then, is the principle always applicable, that of our entire possessions every dollar, every cent, is to be employed in the way that will best honor God."

These arguments are irrefutable. We must impress upon the minds of our people not so much the exact proportion of their income they owe to the Lord, or the number of dollars each one ought to give, as the fact that they owe themselves, their talents and their possessions, yea, that their indebtedness to their God is beyond computation. Eternity will be too short, and the opportunities in heaven not sufficient, for the payment of our debt of gratitude to Him who gave us our being, purchased our souls, and made us heirs of glory. If this were the conviction of our people generally, there would be no lack of funds with which to carry on the Lord's work, and no lack of men to do the Lord's bidding. That boy who put himself into the contribution basket was right, strange as his conduct may have seemed. He gave his all. The poor widow gave *all her living*, although she had only two mites. She gave in quantity very little, but her example was worth more than all the riches cast into the treasury by the wealthy. Moreover, God is not dependent on a certain amount of money. He can make a penny do as much good as a dollar. A penny tract may open the eyes of a heathen and be instrumental in gaining a missionary, or in opening a new field of missionary labor. God does not take into account the number of dollars His people contribute, but the spirit in which the contributions are made.

In view of all this it is evident that our people must become more thoroughly Christian before they will contribute more liberally. A true and intelligent Christian does not complain when the pastor announces a collection

or urges that more liberal contributions ought to be made, but rather rejoices that he has another opportunity for the exercise of his faith. And yet it is important that our people understand just exactly what they ought to do for a certain purpose. There are so many places where our support is needed that we ought to give our people an idea as to the proportion they should give to the various objects.

Our *General Institution Treasury* needs our first attention. In Columbus, at Afton, at Hickory, and at Woodwille, is where our workman are being prepared for work. When once all the positions in these various institutions are filled, there will be no less than sixteen professors engaged in this noble work of educating young men for the office of the ministry and of teaching Christian schools. A large number of the young men in attendance in our colleges and seminaries are not in a condition financially to meet their own expenses. If they are to get ready for the work in which they are willing to engage, they must be supported by the Church. For years we have been praying the Lord of the harvest to put it into the minds of young men that they ought to prepare themselves for these public duties in the Church. The Lord has heard our prayers and filled a number of our institutions to their utmost capacity. This necessitates the erection of new buildings at considerable expense. And the Holy Spirit has seen fit to send us still more indigent young men who must either be sent home or supported. It would be mockery not to accept them when God sends them in answer to prayer. But all this is an indication of Providence that more liberal things are expected of our people.

If, within the bounds of synod, one half as many dollars were raised as there are communicant members in synod, we should have the necessary funds for all the current expenses of all the institutions. All right, says a member of one of our wealthy congregations, there are four

hundred communicant members connected with our congregation, we will accordingly pay $200 and that will settle matters for us. Not so fast, please. Are there not persons in your congregation who alone ought to give that amount? Remember there is a Scriptural rule for giving. "Let every one of you lay by him in store as God has prospered him." 1 Cor. 16, 2. Here is a man living in a mansion, on an excellent farm of 200 hundred acres yielding good crops, steps up to the collector and says triumphantly, here's my portion and hands over 50 cents. A poor widow upon whom six children are depending for their support, with no income but what she earns at the wash-tub, comes up next with her fifty cents and humbly asks, do you think that is enough for me? Where is the equality, where the justice? The fifty cents may not be too much for the widow, but fifty dollars would have been more nearly the rich farmer's portion. Few congregations are so poor that they cannot collect their apportionment, half as many dollars as there are adult members in the congregation, but there are congregations that ought to be heartily ashamed to send in no more than that amount. "As God hath prospered" applies to congregations as well as to individuals. Right here is the difficulty in the way of collecting needful funds. Our own human rule, which was not intended as a rule, is substituted for the divine rule. The circumstances of an individual may be such that even one-tenth would not be a sufficient amount to give. That was the Old Testament rule, and Christians should be ashamed to have the haughty Pharisee excel them in good deeds, but the New Testament rule is better and in cases requires more. By the way of illustration, a man has an income of $500 and according to close calculation it will take that whole amount to support himself and family. It will be difficult for him to give $50 annually for the support of the Church. Another man needs just the same amount to support himself and family

but gets a salary of $1000. It will be much easier for this man to give $100 yea, he could give $500 easier than the other man can give $50.

Possibly there is no one thing so much in the way of raising the money needed for the work of synod as the lack of system in collecting it. Some still adhere to the rusty old way of an occasional hat-collection. In fact some people will not introduce anything new in the congregation. This is the way our fathers did and we don't want to be better than our fathers now resting in their graves. Possibly their fathers plowed with wooden plows, threshed with the flail, and made their journeys on foot. What an insult to their sainted dead to use the modern improvements upon their farms!

What we need is system, and that system thoroughly executed. A system that works well in one congregation may not do in another congregation. We can therefore simply make suggestions.

The congregation ought to be canvassed by a committee appointed for that purpose. Subscriptions should cover no less than a year, and should be paid over in installments, either monthly or quarterly. This work should be done thoroughly, no one should be passed by. When the year is drawing to a close, see to it that all subscriptions are paid up. If there are quarterly or monthly meetings of the congregation, or within the congregation, these moneys could be paid at those meetings and thus have a fixed time for the payment of each installment. Should there be no such gatherings, let each subscriber be furnished with as many envelopes as he has installments to pay, and let these be thrown into the basket whenever the person has the money to pay. If it is observed that the subscriptions are meager, take up an occasional basket collection in the congregation to make up the deficiency. The pastor should not forget to subscribe and to contribute to this treasury as well as his members.

An occasional special service for the purpose of instructing the people and filling them with enthusiasm, will be a great help. We are serving a people who want to know and understand what they are contributing for, and they have a right to know, and we ought to be willing to give them all the information they desire. Our people are not as stingy as they are uninformed. Besides holding services for this special purpose, we want to see to it that every family in the congregation is supplied with a church paper. Nothing will aid our people more to understand the work of synod than to read every week what the Church is doing.

What we have here said with speciai reference to our main treasury will apply also to our other treasuries. We need money for the support of our missionaries, and we ought to undertake many fields already ripe for the sickle, and that would require more money. There are small and poor congregations that need church edifices but cannot furnish the money needed to this end. We have a so-called Church Building Fund, which is however only the name of an empty treasury. Incalculable good could be done if we had thousands in this treasury with which to erect churches for needy congregations.

Dear brethren, I have carried out the resolution of our Board, and do now in its name send forth these words for your encouragement in the way of supporting the work of our synod. May these words not have been written in vain. In your own interest, in the interest you have in the undying souls of men and therefore in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the name of Him who purchased the Church with His own blood, with the strength and wisdom furnished from on high, take up the work you must recognize as your own; and be assured that the great Head of the Church will abide with you and prosper you and abundantly reward you in time and eternity. D. Simon.

THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST.

This is the baptism on which rivalists love to expatiate. It is the only baptism in which they believe, from which they expect any blessed results, and to which they all lay special claim; insisting that they have received the extraordinary baptism of the Holy Ghost, and that all who would be Christians must be so baptized. They look with pity upon the old-fashioned churches with their "water-baptism," as they are pleased to call it, and feel specially called of God to introduce spiritual religion among those who have not yet had the benefit of their superior baptism.

Who gave revivalists permission to lay hands on the sacrament of baptism, and to take from it the Spirit, leaving us simply the water? What spirit taught them to interpret John 3, 5, in these words; "born, *not of water, but of the Spirit*", as we have heard a revivalist deliver himself? Christ says, "born *of water and the Spirit.*" What God has joined together, let not those who claim to be baptized only with the Holy Ghost put asunder.

That there was a baptism of the Holy Ghost separate from and independent of the sacrament of baptism we gladly admit. The Scriptures so teach. But that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was intended for all, or even a majority of Christians, that this is the baptism which Christ means in His Great Commission, Matt. 28, 19; and that this is the baptism which regenerates and makes disciples, for which reason a very subordinate place must be assigned to "water-baptism",—all this we positively deny. Moreover we assert, that there are no Christians living to-day who received the extraordinary and immediate baptism of the "Holy Ghost" and of "fire", during revivals, to the contrary notwithstanding. Let us see what is written.

Matt. 3, 11, John the Baptist says: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." On these words Matthew Henry remarks: It is Christ's prerogative to baptize *with the Holy Ghost.* This he did in the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit conferred upon the apostles, to which Christ himself applies these words of John, Acts 1, 5. The baptism of the Holy Ghost consisted in conferring, not the ordinary and common, but *extraordinary gifts of the Spirit.* According to Mark 1, 8, John said: 'I baptized you with water; but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost; according to Luke 3, 16, 'I indeed baptize you with water; . . . He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.

Now we happily have Christ's own comment on these words of John. Acts 1, 4. 5. we read: 'And, being assembled together with them'—namely, with 'the apostles whom he had chosen,' v. 2.—, 'he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, whichye heard from me: for John indeed baptized with water; *but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.*' Now *this gift of the Holy Ghost* thus promised, thus prophesied of, thus waited for, is that which we find the apostles received in the next chapter, for in that this promise had its full accomplishment; that was it *that shall come,* and *we look for no other;* for it is here promised to be given *not many days hence.* He does not tell them how many, because they must keep every day in a frame fit to receive it. Other Scriptures speak of *the gift of the Holy Ghost* to ordinary believers, this speaks of that particular power which, *by the Holy Ghost,* the first preachers of the gospel, and planters of the Church, were endued with, enabling them infallibly to relate to that age, and record to posterity, the doctrine of Christ, and the proofs of it; so

that by virtue of this promise, and the performance of it, we receive the New Testament as of divine inspiration, and venture our souls upon it."—Matt. Henry in loc.

The immediate effect of this baptism of the Holy Ghost was, that those who received it *spoke with new tongues*, that is, in languages which they had not learned before. Acts 2, 4: "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." There were also other extraordinary gifts bestowed, besides the gift of tongues; but this appears as the most immediate and prominent, and prove that the Holy Spirit had fallen upon them.

By the hand of the apostles the baptism of the Holy Ghost, with its miraculous gifts, was bestowed also on certain disciples, either before or after they had received the sacrament of baptism. Acts 10, 44–48. (R. V.) we read: "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed, were amazed, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. *For they heard them speak with tongues*, and magnify God. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ." Relating this same outpouring of the Spirit on the Gentiles, Peter says, Chap. 11, 15: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, *even as on us at the beginning*," namely, on Pentecost. "*And I remembered the word of the Lord*, how that He said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Peter being reminded again of the Lord's promise, proves that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was something extraordinary and uncommon, and not received by all believers, whom the Lord added unto the church daily.

Acts 19, 1–7, we read: "And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper country came to Ephesus, and found certain disciples: and he said unto them, Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed? And they said unto him, Nay, we did not so much as hear whether the Holy Ghost was given [marg.: whether there is a Holy Ghost]. And he said, Into what then were ye baptized? And they said, Into John's baptism. And Paul said, John baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on Him which should come after him, that is, on Jesus. And when they heard this, they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; *and they spake with tongues and prophesied.* And they were in all about twelve men." Chap. 8, 14–19: "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: for as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. *Now when Simon saw* that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay my hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost." How did Simon see it? Evidently by their speaking with tongues, or prophesying.

That certain believers also, especially such as were destined to be preachers of the gospel and planters of the church, were endued with extraordinary and miraculous gifts of the Spirit, like the apostles, was in accordance with Christ's promise, Mark 16, 17. 18: "And these signs shall follow them that believe: in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take

up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall in no wise hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." That some only, and not all believers received these extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit, is evident from Paul's words: "Are all workers of miracles? have all gifts of healings? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" The context shows that the apostle expects these questions to be answered in the negative. Only some had these gifts.

Now we ask our modern revivalists, and all others who put little value on "water baptism": Are the above miracles common among you? During the last century, for example, how many of you received the gift of tongues, and of healing, as the apostles and some of the first Christians received them? Speaking the truth, you will answer, Few, if any. *Then the baptism of the Holy Ghost is by no means such a common thing among you, as you are wont to boast over against our water-baptism.*

Strictly speaking, there is now no baptism of the Holy Ghost apart from the *Sacrament of Baptism* — apart from "*the water*," Acts 10,47, "*water and the Spirit*," John 3, 5, "*the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost*," Tit. 3, 5, *through which God according to His mercy saved us.* "Eight souls were saved through water: which also after a true likeness (marg. in the antitype) *doth now save you, even baptism*," 1 Ptr. 3, 21.

As the times are upon us, in which the foundations are being examined and creeds revised, would it not be well for the sects to examine also the nature and purpose of baptism, in connection with Christ's Great Commission, Matt. 28, 19.

GEO. DILLMANN.

HOMILETIC RULES.

(From J. A. Quenstedt's "Ethica pastoralis." Translated by Rev. E. Schultz.)

I.

A minister should never occupy his pulpit without being honestly prepared.

The faculty of true preaching, according to the will of God, and with benefit to souls, is not the work of human industry, nor the result of precept given by science; but it is a gift of God, and has its principal source in Him, as Melanchthon has justly said; but God nevertheless requires diligence at our hands. For, on the part of a Christian orator, it would be a sign not only of negligence, but also of temerity, if he should make such very high and divine things the subject of his speech and yet enter upon his discourse without preparation, and deliver his sermon without preceding meditation. The command of St. Paul to such is (1 Tim. 4, 15): "Meditate upon these things. (*ταῦτα μελέτα.*)" Periander of Corinth says: "Preparation is everything (*Μελέτη τὸ πᾶν.*)" It is told of the Athenian orator Perikles, that he did not respond to the repeated solicitations of the people, for the reason, as he said, that he was not prepared. And when Demosthenes was requested by the Athenians to advise them, he refused, saying: "*οὐ συντέταγμαι,*" he had not considered the matter. Also Tullius (Cicero) writes of himself, that he did not ascend the rostrum without preparation. How much more must they who take upon themselves the office of teaching Christian people, be careful never to preach a sermon by pouring out boldly and without forethought, whatever happens to enter their minds and slip from their tongue, and so shamefully to dishonor this high office before God and the holy

angels and the Church. Dr. Aeg. Hunnius says aptly: "They who, confiding in their natural powers of oratory, blab out everything extempore as it happens to drop from their lips, ought to be highly censured and reproved, because they treat and talk, in the presence of God and the Church and the holy angels, so negligently concerning a matter touching God's name and honor and the eternal welfare of the people. For this impious and insufferable laziness they will be obliged to give a strict account to the great Shepherd." Dr. Chytraeus says in Prolegom. Rhetor: "Some pulpit-orators boast that they shake their sermons, as it were, out of their coat sleeves. This folly and indolence ought to be driven out of them with a cane." Sarcer says in his Pastorale p. 43: "It is great impertinence, presumption and wickedness, a disregard of God and His Word, and an indication that there can be no fear of God, where any one has the time to study and prepare his sermons, and no studying is done. It will not do to say that such a one wants to show his art and cleverness, his expertness and skill. For be you ever so learned, and may you have preached for ever so long a time, yet it is necessary to study."

It is therefore necessary to prepare your sermon carefully, and to trim everything, before uttering it with the tongue, (cunctaque prius ad limam quam ad linguam revocanda). The more diligently we prepare, the more apt and forcible will be our speech. Gregor M., lib. VI Moral. c. 16, says: "Preachers must absorb quietly what they are to pour out in performing the duties of their office." Erasmus, in rebuking "those extemporaneous fellows, who do not think what to say before the time comes to speak" says in his book De Lingua p. 26: "It often happens that they, not having premeditated what they want to say, also do not remember what they have said, and so it sometimes happens that, having uttered a thing presumptuously, they deny it again

with like presumption." On page 71 he says: "Nobody utters more idle words in speaking than they who either do not understand the subject on which they speak, or have not thought sufficiently on the subject. "O happy lips," writes Hieronymus, "that never utter things which they might be glad to be able to recall." Luther remarks in an explanatory note to Ps. 47, 7 about the words "with understanding": "In preaching you must handle the Word with diligence and dwell upon it, and not rant and blab like the wild and furious screamers and babblers, and the presumptuous preachers who talk what happens to enter their mind." He that throws out a raw and undigested mass does not produce but miscarries.

A wrongly directed ambition leads those ministers who dare to preach without previous preparation, extempore, and, as it were, standing upon one leg. "For while such extemporaneous performers try to appear smart to the simple people, on account of their being able to speak without preparation, they appear silly to people of understanding," as Quintilian says in lib. X. c. 7. The word spoken by the Savior to His disciples, Matt. 10, 19: "Take no thought how or what ye shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak," does not in the least excuse this laziness, or rather impudence. For this text does not do away with study, but promises assistance, and does not treat of preaching among Christians, but of the unexpected confession among persecutors, as Theophylact teaches when he says: "He tells them to be of good courage and without fear; for if we are to preach among those of the faith, then it is of importance to prepare ourselves and to be ready to defend ourselves, as St. Peter advises. But among a raving rabble and before kings He promises us His strength, that we may not fear. For it is ours to confess, but to answer wisely belongs to God."

Some that are given to idleness or find pleasure in drinking in company, or are occupied too much with household cares, do not think of their sermons till Sunday reminds them of their duty. Some even are driven to meditation only by the reminder given in church, and boast that they are able to shake their sermons out of their sleeves, as it were. But that is wicked, unwise and presumptuous. It is sure that an audience, waiting for careful instruction, will tolerate nothing with less grace than lack of diligence in meditation. But anyone who speaks and is well equipped and prepared, is welcome, and is able to speak with greater confidence and will move his audience more deeply. Therefore, a pious preacher of the Word of God will begin early to ponder upon his sermon, having first earnestly implored the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and he will not only carefully consider the subjects about which to speak, but also the manner of speaking the sentences and words. He forms a judgment about what he reads, and converts it so to say into flesh and blood, and applies it to the matter in hand. Some apply the particulars to themselves, whatever they wish to incorporate into their sermon, and, in a somewhat elevated voice, they teach, admonish, advise, instruct and console themselves. Others, in preparing for their sermon, think about what they want to say, while taking walks and collect material by quiet meditation, arrange what they have gathered, and put it into proper form, but, relying upon their memory, they write nothing. This manner of meditation is approved by but few. For whoever is not blessed with a very good memory, will in this way burden himself with enormous mental labor. Others will make use of writing also, and apply their pen industriously. And these again will not all proceed in the same manner. About this we will speak under the following head.

II.

The sermon should be written properly and neatly by the minister himself.

Whoever wishes to fix his sermon in his memory easily and firmly, let him write it down himself neatly and properly disposed (quam ornatissime, quam ordinatissime). Neatness of writing saves trouble in reading, and an orderly disposition is the principal aid to memory, yea, the soul of it, according to Plato. Whatever you wish to intrust to your memory, you must first reduce to perfect order. Set order aside, and you will increase your labor very greatly, and memorize with great difficulty what you will soon forget. For, according to Aristotle, whatever is orderly disposed, will be retained by the memory. Undigested, hasty compilation of matter is the enemy of memory.

But the minister of the Word should write his sermon with his own hand, for by writing it himself he impresses it upon his memory. He must not write in very small letters, because old age will approach, and the eyes will become weak. He also should write carefully and neatly, so that he may read with pleasure; for confused and slovenly writing is not even considered worth reading. He who has not practiced good writing, will hurry with his pen through the pages, and fill them, but will afterwards hardly be able to read them.

Not all observe the same method in writing their sermons. Some prepare a skeleton, writing in proper order first the theme, then the parts, and not only some, but all the principal parts as well as the subdivisions very minutely, and designate them by formal signs placed beside them. Dr. Mueller, in his Orat. Eccles. p. 52, prefers this method before all others. Some again, and among them very learned theologians, write their sermons word for word. Others note down only the principal parts of their subject in Latin or

in the vernacular, and either omit the subdivisions entirely, or note only a very few of them. Others take a medium course and set down the substance of the discourse methodically and exactly, but very briefly and summarily. They note the subdivisions of every part and doctrinal article, and the passages of Scripture and illustrations belonging to it, adding the proper formal connections, and leave everything else for meditation.

They who note down only the principal parts of the sermon, do not seem to do their duty sufficiently, as Dr. Aeg. Hunnius, Method. Concion., judges. It is the safest at the beginning of these efforts, and is not only useful for the younger and less practiced, but also necessary as well to obtain a greater command of words as also to strengthen the memory, that the sermon be written word for word. For in this way the mind is compelled to dwell longer upon the subject, and by writing the sermon upon paper it is, so to say, written into the soul. But I believe, that in time the method ought to be changed. They that have more practice, and are well equipped in language as well as substance, may mark down the principal parts and the subdivisions of the parts, and also the passages of Scripture and examples, and add a few words especially expressive, if they can do no more for lack of time from other official business. But in delivering the sermon you should not be confined too much to the writing. If the subject requires it, you will speak with more freedom, and by a happy expression, born from the impulse of the moment, you will more readily rouse or allay the feelings. He who by practice and habit has gained command of the passages of Scripture and the forms of doctrinal expression, and also has such command of language that it is easy for him always to find the correct word, may save much labor of writing. If, after the sermon is written, you add something here, and take away something there, now insert a few words, again strike out some, and so never

are satisfied with yourself, you will only succeed by this critical carefulness to double the labor of memorizing; and because the even flow of impressions made by a clearly written page is disturbed, your delivery in the pulpit will be broken and lame, as J. H. Ursinus well remarks.

III.

The day on which the sermon is to be written and memorized, you are not to be occupied with anything else, and to be free from cares and distractions, and moderate in eating and drinking.

Since it is quite difficult and something great to speak from memory for a considerable length of time, as orators and preachers are obliged to do, we advise especially the young and inexperienced servants of the Church, to omit all other business, meditation and reading, and not distract the mind with worldly cares, on the day on which the sermon is to be written and memorized. For these are like burdens that oppress the heart, so that it can not rise to spiritual things. They are thorns that choke the growth of meditation, waters that extinguish the flames of pious affection. The soul must be free from all other distractions and cares, because a force that is divided among several objects, is too powerless for one. It must be free from grief; for it is remarkable how seriously it weakens memory. The more lighthearted we are, the more easily we can give ourselves to meditation. Besides rest and quietude of mind and freedom from other business and cares, a reasonable diet is required, that is, a moderate use of food and drink, also a room as secluded as possible, and free from noise and visitors. Orators also recommend not too much light, and a somewhat retired locality, that the thoughts and the mind be not disturbed by the great variety of objects pressing upon the senses. Some go to rest, after partaking of a light supper, to arise again about midnight, after the first sleep is over, and mem-

orize their sermon; but such labor is not advisable, because sleepless nights are not to be recommended. It is far better to run over the sermon on the day preceding, and to repeat it over and over, than to weaken the memory by immediately preceding efforts, and to tire it out in this way, and to exhaust the powers of mind and body before the action begins. For the preacher has to see to it by all means, not to enter the pulpit with his powers diminished and weakened by meditation and study. Dr. John Grosse, in Method. Conci. says: "The day on which you wish to study, you are not to do anything else. For then, if you should awake in the night, you will have your whole sermon before your mind, and be easily able to repeat it."

IV.

You should firmly impress upon your memory the leading thoughts of the whole sermon, the skeleton, the principal parts and the sub-divisions.

A minister of the Gospel should have a mind capable not only of grasping quickly and retaining firmly what he reads, but also ready to reproduce whatever is called for. Whoever is troubled with a very bad memory can hardly be called well fitted for this office. Some commit the whole sermon to memory, word for word, with great pains, and in its delivery bind themselves down to the words so much that, if they should happen to forget a word as it is written, they would get confused, mix up the different parts, destroy the whole order of the sermon, and find themselves compelled to stop entirely before the sermon is properly finished. This plan is condemned by nearly all.

Others advise the repeated reading of the whole sermon, and that not many times; for they contend that frequent repetition weakens the memory. Others again commit the sermon to memory by paragraphs, by repeating them aloud.

Yet others read a passage carefully, and, laying aside the manuscript, ponder upon the meaning quietly. Isidor says in his book concerning the highest good, in chapter 14, at the end: "Quiet reading is more acceptable to the senses than reading aloud. A person's intellect is sharpened more, if the voice of the reader is silent, and only the tongue is moved quietly; for by reading aloud the body is tired out, and the sound of the voice produces exhaustion." Charles Regius advises the pulpit orator to commit to memory with a subdued voice, as it were murmuring; "for," says he, "perfect silence allows other thoughts to arise; but by a murmuring sound and by giving expression to the words, the subject is impressed more firmly." Some advise the preacher first to go through the sermon mentally only, then by murmuring the words, and finally by repeating them with a loud voice. For in this way, by the twofold activity of speaking and hearing, you may aid memory. May this be as it will, at any rate, the preacher should impress upon his memory the skeleton of the whole sermon, or the different parts, and in the parts the different sections.

In order to remember more easily the skeleton, you may write it on the edges of the pages, or you may underscore or write in large letters the principal parts of the sermon, and at the same time begin a new line for every section, so as to show clearly the arrangement of parts. It will also be a great aid for the memory, if not only a new line is commenced for every part and section, but if the subjects and proofs and the principal passages of Scripture are marked with differently colored lines, and if the quotations are marked at the edge of the page.

Memorize the sermon immediately after writing it, when the collected and arranged material is as yet clearly before the mind. Memorizing and meditating is done best during the morning hours when the mind is fresh, but it should not be overtaxed by continual repetition, and periods of rest

should be allowed. Carl Regius (*Orator Christ.*) observes: "The minister should commit his sermon at the proper time, and not wait till time presses so that he is obliged to force his memory." This weakens the mental powers, and so to say dries up the spirit and reduces the liveliness necessary for an impressive delivery.

The late Dr. Dannhauer (*Consc. theol.*) asks the question, whether in any case the sermon may be read from the manuscript. He answers it by saying: "Why not, in case memory becomes weak by reason of old age! For if teaching from the desk in the university is usually done by reading, what should hinder the sermon to be read from the pulpit in extraordinary cases? Otherwise it is a part of good address to deliver it from memory, and it is a sort of shiftlessness to read it from the manuscript."

V.

Arrange your sermon logically, and divide the material contained in the text properly into numbers and parts.

"Without a proper arrangement of parts, the sermon is a corpse," says Dr. Henry Mueller, in Orator eccl. Charles Regius (Orat. Christ.) remarks: "Just as bricks promiscuously piled together do not constitute a house, but do so only after they are properly laid and cemented according to rule; so it is only a conglomeration of various material, and no speech, if the material—may there be ever so much of it in the make-up of the sermon—is not sifted, and what belongs together aptly connected."

Masenius (*Palaestra Orat.*) says: "It is not enough for a general to be the leader of a strong army. If he does not arrange it by regiments in a line of battle suitable to the circumstances, he will fight without gaining the victory."

But the logical arrangement is the proper and suitable disposition of the accumulated material, or an orderly combination of the different parts of the sermon. Or, according

to Lic. Carpzov: "It is a suitable combination of the parts of the sermon, an apt and harmonious distribution of the material to be taken out of the text and to be spoken concerning it, and of which sufficient has been gathered for the different parts of the sermon." A logical arrangement is absolutely necessary, as well for the memory of the speaker as also for the hearers. Cicero in his *De Orat.* teaches, that a suitable logical arrangement is a very great help for the memory. Gerhard John Vossius in his *Instit. Orat.* says: "Order is the greatest evidence of a scientific and industrious mind." Order is of use for the speaker, to prevent his confusing himself by mixing the different subjects of his speech. He who jumps from one subject to another, and connects things promiscuously, confuses himself. Order is of use for the hearers, to enable them to grasp and retain everything easily. All confusion is obscuring for the uneducated, and unsatisfactory to the learned and educated, and is displeasing to God, in whose works in every case the wisest order is discernible. Here is to be observed the eulogy of Christoph Luthardt, *De Arte Concion.*: "A logical arrangement is the light of clearness, the brightness of understanding, the teacher of brevity, and the life of memory."

St. Paul, the best of instructors in the method of preaching, admonishes Timothy in his second epistle (called by Chrysostomos the last will and testament of Paul preparing himself for death) in chap. 2, 15: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth (*ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας*)." Dannhauer says correctly (*Colleg. Decalog.*): "The manner and method how to preach consists in this, *to divide the word rightly*, 2 Tim. 2, 15, where *ὀρθοτομεῖν* (to divide rightly) not only means to divide the text into chapters and parts, but also to expound it correctly. St. Paul here alludes very finely to the *symposiarchs*, or rulers of the feast (St. John 2, 9), who were appointed for the purpose of

assorting and distributing the food in the most proper way." Similarly Gerhard in his commentary on this passage adds: "In the word ὀρθοτομεῖν Timothy and every servant of the church is admonished to propound the chief parts of the doctrine in suitable order, and to arrange the biblical text methodically and logically, so as not to separate in teaching what belongs together, and to mix up what should be kept separate. The *subject* to be *rightfully divided* is the Word of God." Therefore to *divide rightly the word of truth*, means: To arrange logically and treat properly the theological matter which is to be handled in the church, according to a definite method and form.

As said before, a good, logical arrangement of matter and form is of great assistance for the memory. He who distinguishes well does also teach well (qui bene distinguit bene docet). Divide well—and half of your work is done; arrange logically your arguments—and your work is nearly completed. If a proper division according to the nature of the subject in hand precedes, the whole array of words and sentences will follow without trouble. A logical arrangement and order is a great help and light as well for the speaker as for the hearer. "Τὸ διορίζειν οὐκ ἔστιν τῶν πολλῶν," says Aristotle. That is: "The common people are not in the habit of distinguishing well." The highest praise for a speaker is, that he distinguishes wisely his subject matter. Fonseca in *Instit. log.* says: "Two paths lead to perception of knowledge: Explanation and separation (definitio et divisio).

According to Dr. Christ. Chemnitz a logical arrangement of a sermon (skeleton) must be: 1.) *Textual*, that is, as indicated by the text. 2.) *Adequate*, that is, exhausting the whole text, and mixing in nothing not contained in it. 3.) *Harmonious and compact*, so that everything stands in close relation to each other, and follows each other in good order. 4.) *Popular*, adapted to the capacity of the hearers, and lastly, 5.) *Short and concise*, so as not to become tedious by

too many divisions and subdivisions. It is therefore required of the sacred orator, that he be: 1.) *Apt at conceiving* what he wishes to say; 2.) *Intelligent*, to make a wise selection; 3.) Able to give to each part of the conceived and selected matter the position exactly suited for it, as an experienced general will arrange his soldiers in order of battle; 4.) To deliver with dignity and fluently what he has arranged.

It is yet to be noticed, that the teachers of the ancient church made but moderate use of the skeleton in their homilies, so that the most of their sermons contain the substantial parts of an oration, but they seldom observe the orderly form of the same. No theme is announced, nor is the discourse based on any, and refutation and argument is introduced without stating the point to be controverted, as Dr. Huelsemann in *Orat. eccl.* remarks. Generally five parts of a sermon are specified: Exordium, Narratio, Propositio, Confirmatio, and Epilogus or Peroratio, that is, Introduction, Narrative, Theme or Subject, Proofs or Argument, and Conclusion or Restatement, to which some add the Confutatio or Refutation. But the use of the Exordium is not always necessary, as we shall explain further on. The Narratio, by which we mean a short summing up of the substance of the text, is seldom used, except in explaining sacred history. Generally the last part of the Exordium is used in place of the Narratio, in which the transition to the text is made, or to the propositio itself, which is a short statement of the whole contents, either divided into parts or as a whole. Also the Confutatio is not necessary, by means of which the arguments of the opposing parties are disproved, since the subject, or the question under consideration, or the time or place are not always of such a nature that a refutation is necessary. According to Huelseman, Carpzov and others the parts of a sermon are: Introduction, Theme, Division, Argument and Conclusion. Description and Refutation are not included by them in the parts of a sermon.

too many divisions and subdivisions. It is therefore required of the sacred orator, that he be: 1.) *Apt at conceiving* what he wishes to say; 2.) *Intelligent*, to make a wise selection; 3.) Able to give to each part of the conceived and selected matter the position exactly suited for it, as an experienced general will arrange his soldiers in order of battle; 4.) To deliver with dignity and fluently what he has arranged.

It is yet to be noticed, that the teachers of the ancient church made but moderate use of the skeleton in their homilies, so that the most of their sermons contain the substantial parts of an oration, but they seldom observe the orderly form of the same. No theme is announced, nor is the discourse based on any, and refutation and argument is introduced without stating the point to be controverted, as Dr. Huelsemann in *Orat. eccl.* remarks. Generally five parts of a sermon are specified: Exordium, Narratio, Propositio, Confirmatio, and Epilogus or Peroratio, that is, Introduction, Narrative, Theme or Subject, Proofs or Argument, and Conclusion or Restatement, to which some add the Confutatio or Refutation. But the use of the Exordium is not always necessary, as we shall explain further on. The Narratio, by which we mean a short summing up of the substance of the text, is seldom used, except in explaining sacred history. Generally the last part of the Exordium is used in place of the Narratio, in which the transition to the text is made, or to the propositio itself, which is a short statement of the whole contents, either divided into parts or as a whole. Also the Confutatio is not necessary, by means of which the arguments of the opposing parties are disproved, since the subject, or the question under consideration, or the time or place are not always of such a nature that a refutation is necessary. According to Huelseman, Carpzov and others the parts of a sermon are: Introduction, Theme, Division, Argument and Conclusion. Description and Refutation are not included by them in the parts of a sermon.